

days of each other. John Blair will be missed, as will Phil Hart—each for his contributions to the fight for the same goal: a free and democratic society. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Adams' statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN M. BLAIR AND PHILIP A. HART
IN MEMORIAM

Christmas Week 1976 was marred by the loss of two prominent fighters for a free and democratic society.

Philip A. Hart, the gentle man from Michigan, animated by deep moral convictions, and rightly recognized as the conscience of the United States Senate consistently stood in the forefront of the civil rights battles for human dignity and the antitrust battles for economic freedom. Like Estes Kefauver, his predecessor as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Philip Hart helped us understand the significance of concentrated economic power and the threat it poses to a free society. An unassuming, unassertive, patient teacher, Senator Hart seemed blithely immune to the organized pressure of vested interests, obeying to the very last the command of Micah: to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.

John M. Blair fought for the same ideals, but in a markedly different style. A charismatic, flamboyant, and often cantankerous person, with populist roots in the American heartland, Blair exercised a profound influence on official Washington for more than 30 years. Combining an all-consuming interest in the study of political economy with a penchant for public interest activism, he left an indelible mark on the orientation of the economics profession and the thinking of government policy makers. He was the prototype of the incurably curious scholar and the incorruptible public servant.

Blair's career in Washington started in 1938, amidst the electrifying excitement of the New Deal, and was one long, tumultuous battle against industrial monopoly and establishment economics. He was a young economist with the Temporary National Economic Committee (the Joint Congressional Com-

mittee which produced the landmark hearings and reports on economic concentration), with the U.S. Smaller War Plants Corporation, and later chief economist with the Federal Trade Commission. The captains of industry and the spokesmen for special interests quickly (and justifiably) came to regard Blair as an able analyst and articulate gadfly who was prepared (as Paul Douglas once noted on the Senate floor) to struggle valiantly and against considerable odds to "preserve the system of competitive capitalism from the encroachments of monopoly."

Blair reached the acme of his government career when, in 1956, he became chief economist of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. With the firm support, first of Senator Kefauver and later Senator Hart, he was the central motive force behind the subcommittee's extensive investigations of the structure, conduct, and performance of such industries as steel, automobiles, drugs, and oil. He made the subcommittee a prime forum for collecting evidence on administered pricing and its implications. Following Gardiner C. Means, much to the chagrin of the conventional wisdom in economics, he sought to demonstrate that administered prices were perversely raised in the face of falling demand and deepening recession in order to meet predetermined profit targets. He tried to show how such perverse pricing tended to vitiate conventional monetary and fiscal policy and to aggravate the problem of inflation in the midst of recession—a problem for which traditional economic theory had no satisfactory explanation or cure. The subcommittee's record, produced under Blair's guidance and contained in some 50 volumes, will be a treasure trove for scholars and government officials for years to come.

After his retirement from the Washington scene, Blair wrote *Economic Concentration*, a widely used textbook in industrial organization, rich in data and replete with insights growing out of his government experience. The *Control of Oil*, published within a week after his death, represents the culmination of Blair's quarter-century interest in the oil industry, dating back at least to 1952, when the Federal Trade Commission issued its "Report on the International Petroleum Cartel," prepared under his direction and rated by friendly and hostile critics alike as of historic importance. In the book, Blair argues

that the Seven Sisters of the international oil industry exercise pervasive monopoly control of supply and markets which is so inimical to the public interest that it must either be controlled by effective regulation or, preferably, neutralized through comprehensive dissolution, divorce, and divestiture.

John M. Blair was an institutional economist par excellence. He was a soldier in "that small but brave army of men who preferred to see the truth obscurely and imperfectly rather than to maintain error, reached indeed with clearness and consistency and by easy logic but based on hypotheses inappropriate to the facts." The ranks of that army are woefully depleted by the deaths of John Blair and Philip Hart.

WALTER ADAMS,
Michigan State University.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

James P. Buchele, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years, vice E. Edward Johnson, resigning.

Robert B. King, of West Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice John A. Field III, resigned.

Kenneth J. Mighell, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Michael P. Carnes, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, July 6, 1977, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPREME COURT RULING CONTRADICTS STATE DEPARTMENT STAND ON RHODESIAN OFFICE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, in its editions of Sunday, June 26, 1977, the Baltimore News American published an excellent article on the State Department efforts to close down the Rhodesian Information Office in Washington, D.C.

The article was written by Kingsbury Smith, national editor for the Hearst newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT RULING CONTRADICTS STATE DEPARTMENT STAND ON RHODESIAN OFFICE (By Kingsbury Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department's contention that the United States is obliged by the United Nations to close down the Rhodesian Information Office in Washington appears to be in direct contradiction with the position of the United States Supreme Court.

Responding to the request of 44 members of the House of Representatives for a "full explanation" of the administration's plan to close the information office, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance informed the congressmen that "as a signatory to the United Nations Charter, the United States is obliged to observe sanctions passed by the Security Council."

Virginia's independent Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., made available to The Hearst Newspapers information which showed that in 1973 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld decisions of two lower courts that the American government was not obligated to adhere to UN resolutions, and especially not if Congress opposed such resolutions.

Ten days ago the Senate expressed strong opposition to the closing down of the Rhodesian Information Office on the grounds that it would curb the free flow of information. By a voice vote, the Senate adopted an amendment to the State Department authorization bill which said: "It is the sense of the Congress that any foreign country should be allowed to maintain an information office in the United States."

Both Sen. Byrd, who denounced the administration's support for the UN resolution as demonstrating "a dangerous lack of concern for the very principles upon which this nation was founded," and Rep. Richard H. Ichord, D-Mo., one of the sponsors of the letter to Secretary Vance, said the State Department's position was contrary to the Supreme Court's ruling.

That ruling, Ichord added, "certainly contradicts Secretary Vance's letter to us."

Byrd and Ichord, as well as other members of both houses, believe the closing down of the Rhodesian Information Office would also be a violation of a 1973 act of Congress. That act declared it to be the policy of the United States "to promote the rights of freedom of opinion and expression, including the free-

dom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

The act further said the promotion of "open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability" and "is in the interests of the United States."

"Closing down the Rhodesian Information Office would fly in the face of that act," Rep. Ichord said. "It would be in direct contradiction with it."

Sen. Byrd recalled that in 1972 the Senate adopted his amendment to exempt the United States from the United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Rep. Charles C. Diggs, D-Mich., challenged the amendment in court.

On June 19, 1972, the U.S. District Court ruled that "the proposition that the United States has somehow surrendered its sovereignty to the United Nations is soundly rejected."

"Congress," the court added, "has the constitutional authority to abrogate in whole or in part the treaty obligations of the United States. This was a political, economic and foreign policy determination. It is not for this court to strike it down."

On Oct. 31, 1972, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the lower court's ruling with the comment: "It is settled constitutional doctrine that Congress may nullify in whole or in part a treaty commitment." On April 16, 1973, the United States Supreme Court let stand the rulings of both lower courts.

Sen. Byrd pointed out that when the Senate last March re-imposed the ban on the shipment of Rhodesian chrome into the United States, it also approved his amendment giving the president authority to lift American sanctions against Rhodesia "if he determines that such suspension would encourage meaningful negotiations."

The senator said the president therefore has plenty of authority to exempt the United States from the UN Security Council's action calling for the closing down of the Rhodesian Information Offices in all UN member states.

Stanley L. Sonnerfield, acting director of the Treasury Dept.'s Foreign Assets Control Division, told The Hearst Newspapers last week that he was awaiting a presidential executive order to close down the Rhodesian Information Office in Washington. That would be done on the grounds that the Rhodesian government had no right to transfer funds to this country, and no Rhodesian official or agent had a right to operate in the United States.

However, it was learned that State Dept. lawyers are exploring other legal possibilities for closing down the information office without the issuance of an executive order.

In view of strong congressional and public (mail) opposition to the curbing of the free flow of information, it is apparently thought it would be better to spare President Carter the attention that would be focused on him if he issues an executive order closing down the information office.

To date, the President and the State Dept. seem determined to carry out the commitment made to the United Nations when the United States supported the Security Council action on May 27.

FARMERS AND SENIOR CITIZENS PAY FOR INFLATION

HON. RICHARD NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to me by William

Claussen of Hardwick, Minn. Hardwick is a small farming community in the southwestern part of the State.

Mr. Claussen makes a simple and eloquent plea for reordering our budgetary priorities so that agriculture and senior citizens are not shortchanged by an inflationary military spending policy that remains unchecked.

The letter follows:

Oat prices down, corn prices down, soybean prices down and wheat prices down. Last year, 1976, we celebrated the two-hundredth anniversary of our nation, and although none of us living today were around then, history tells us that people did without many of the things we take for granted today. But one of the things they could not do without then was food, nor can we do without it today. Yet, after two-hundred years or more of producing that absolutely necessary commodity, after everyone else has taken their bite, it seems the American farmers get the crumbs.

It is said the farmers are a minority and cannot do anything about it. Yet, it is this minority that is producing enough food for our nation and half the world besides! While other segments of the economy are raising their prices and salaries to offset inflation, the farmers have no control and cannot set their prices to offset their staggering and inflated cost of production.

And while we are on the subject of inflation, I believe it was in the latter part of 1974 when Gerald Ford was president that he said inflation was our worst enemy—but three years later, with a defense budget of, I believe, one-hundred and eleven billion dollars, how much of it is allocated to fighting inflation?

It seems to me that inflation is a cancer eating away at our economy and must be stamped out. It is especially hard on the elderly who worked hard to make our nation great and saved a small nest egg to travel and enjoy life after their working years were over, only to see their nest egg eaten away by inflation and hardly stretching their social security check from month to month for a bare living. Can they help but feel frustrated and let down?

Also, I have often wondered if our brilliant scientists who have made it possible for men to walk on the moon and to send landers all the way to Mars and manipulate them from the earth might not be able to come up with an alternate or substitute for oil as the day of the oil wells running dry is getting nearer.

THE NEED TO PRESERVE THE WEST LAKE AREA OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLA.

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill which I hope will assure the preservation, conservation, and protection of the natural scenic, hydrological, floral, faunal, and recreational values of the West Lake area of Broward County, Fla., which is in my congressional district.

There is a popular song that we have all heard entitled "Don't It Make You Want To Go Home," that laments the changes time and prosperity have brought to the environment we knew as children. I think the lyrics say in a poetic way what we all feel. The popularity of

the song seems to indicate that many people identify with the emotions expressed therein:

"There's a drive-in show where the meadow used to grow
And the strawberries used to grow wild.
There's a drag-strip down by the riverside
Where my grandma's cow used to graze.
Now the grass don't grow and the river don't glow
Like it did in my childhood days."

Mr. Speaker, my district is one of the fastest growing areas in the country and it seems that each time I return to it, I am confronted with dramatic changes. Although I welcome progress and growth because I know that it means more people will be able to enjoy living in Florida, I also feel a sense of loss for what used to be. It is not as easy to love a concrete building as it is to love the beautiful tropical scenes and wildlife. It makes me sad to know that future generations will not experience the beauty of undeveloped Florida land with its palm trees, banyan trees, exotic flora, and fauna. I hope there is still time to save the important parts of the land in its natural state.

I had hoped that existing Federal and State programs would be sufficient to save the land included in my bill in its present state, but my inquiries to the Department of the Interior were discouraging. First, the National Park Service advised that it felt the themes of prime significance represented by West Lake were already well represented in the National Park System by Everglades National Park and Biscayne National Monument.

Second, the National Wildlife Refuge System advised that an area must be essential to the preservation of an endangered species or migratory birds, or a unique area of national significance, which West Lake is. But it went further and stated that West Lake does not rank high enough on the national scale—whatever that is—to be considered for acquisition as a national wildlife refuge.

Third, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation—Land and Water Conservation Fund—advised "projects must be in accordance with the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and must be open to the general public for outdoor recreation use." Since the West Lake area is a mangrove swamp it is not suited to recreation in the ordinary sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, a strange situation exists regarding this land. Nobody questions that the area should be preserved, but no existing program at the Federal level quite protects it. It is not big enough, or novel enough, to be a national park. It does not have an abundance of rare species to be a national wildlife refuge. Nor, in all honesty, does it lend itself to recreation as we usually think of it. Therefore, no Federal funding is available under existing law. Ironically, West Lake has many truly outstanding features, yet none are in sufficient quantity to qualify for any of our existing programs.

There is a study presently being conducted by the Department of Interior with regard to the need for Federal urban parks legislation which is supposed to be completed and given to Congress by December 1977. In my opinion, West

Lake qualifies as an ideal example of the need for Federal legislation to preserve undeveloped land in rapid growth areas. Broward County had few more than 50,000 residents when I moved there in 1949 but today it has a population of almost 1 million. Many of these new residents live in high-rise condominiums in densely populated areas. The State, county, and city funds available for the purchase and maintenance of park land are slow to accumulate. However, the increased demands for land drive up costs daily. The result is the gap between money available for parklands, and the cost of acquisition grows instead of diminishing with time.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a majority of the elected officials in Broward County favor preserving West Lake in its natural state because it is the last stand of mangrove of any size in the entire county.

To be more specific, West Lake is a 1,500-acre tract in southeast Broward County, Fla. Before man entered the scene digging canals, replacing the natural flora with a mosaic of structures, roads, and depleting the area of its fresh water supply, the West Lake area was basically a sawgrass marsh. With the digging of canals and wells, a fresh water head was lost, forcing the West Lake area to succumb to the new front of salt water that accompanied the opening of the Port Everglades Inlet and the digging of the Intracoastal Canal. With this the sawgrass basin began to be overtaken by a mangrove community that slowly pushed its way westward, to be stopped by the scrub pine and man's development. Although the West Lake habitat has changed drastically and suddenly from its original flora, a sawgrass marsh could never be restored.

Salt water intrusion has caused a stable mangrove community. Despite the fact that West Lake is somewhat artificial in its birth as a mangrove-dominated system of flora, it remains an invaluable resource to southern Florida and the entire country.

In addition to such tangible benefits as nutrient uptake by plants preventing excessive water pollution, and primary food production for marine, avian, and terrestrial food chains, there is also the intangible benefit to people of a peaceful oasis in an urbanized area.

Few people complained when stands of mangrove along Florida's southeast coast were replaced with seawalled housing developments and shopping plazas. Mangroves are not beautiful trees. The few aerial roots which, like spider legs, prop up the mangrove, make the swamps seem forbidding. Swarms of mosquitos and clinging crab-like creatures lurk within the swamps.

Bacteria and fungi begin to colonize the red mangrove leaves even before they fall. Different fungi live on the leaf at different times. As the leaf particle becomes more and more infested with microbial life it becomes richer in protein. The particles may be eaten and excreted and eaten again many times by different animals; sea worms, little mol-

luskus, shrimp, crabs, and crustaceans. These animals become prey for small fish, like grunts, pinfish, and snappers, that in turn, are eaten by larger fish. Some larger fish, notably the commercially important striped mullet, feed on mangrove detritus directly.

In 1969, two biologists at the University of Miami, Eric Heald and William Odum, demonstrated that in estuaries the red mangrove is actually the basis of an elegant food chain which supports much of southern Florida's unique animal life. Red mangroves were shown by these two scientists to shed more than 3 tons of leaves an acre each year. As these leaves decompose, they are eaten by the little crabs, worms, and other creatures that form the lower links of the food chain. In some Florida mangrove estuaries leaves provide a large percentage of the diets of these animals. The little creatures in turn become prey for many of Florida's fish and tropical birds.

Red mangroves offer more than food. They provide a safe wildlife habitat both on land and around their roots in the water. Moreover, they break up storm waves, and their roots stabilize land vulnerable to the sea.

Almost all the game fish and commercial species in the Florida mangrove go back to the open sea to spawn. The most commercially important of these are the pink shrimp which as adults support an \$18 million a year industry. One female pink shrimp may produce 500,000 or more eggs per year. Although hatched in the Dry Tortugas these eggs make an incredible migration from the Dry Tortugas back to the Florida estuarine marshes to mature.

Mangrove life is a major part of the juvenile pink shrimp's diet. In turn, the red fish or channel bass relishes eating pink shrimp. It is estimated that 75 percent of the game fish and 90 percent of the commercial species of Florida depend on the mangrove system.

The food chain does not end in the water. Many of the birds of Florida rely on mangrove—for example, the roseate spoonbill gets its striking pink coloring from a chemical in shrimp and other crustaceans which it eats. The snowy egret eats by filter feeding small fish found around mangrove trunks.

West Lake vegetation is a portion of the vast mangrove forest which once stretched along the east coast of Florida. Regrettably, it is the last significant stand of mangrove left in Broward County. All four kinds of mangrove are found there although the red mangrove and the white mangrove are most common.

West Lake has an interesting bird population. The wood stork which is on the endangered species list can be found there. The brown pelican and osprey which are on the threatened species list in the State of Florida can be found there. The little blue heron, the common egret, the snowy egret, the Louisiana heron, the yellow crowned and white heron, and the white heron, the royal osprey, the royal tern and the black skimmer are residents in the area.

Mr. Speaker, 86 species of plants were found during a recent plant survey including 24 species of trees, 11 species of shrubs, 37 species of herbs, 9 species of vines, and 5 species of ferns. The greatest value of the flora is its support of wildlife and marine and terrestrial and avian food chains. At least 60 species of birds have been observed feeding at West Lake. Several species of animals, including marsh rabbits, possums, raccoons, and monkeys are also found. Reptiles and amphibians include the red rat snake, the yellow rat snake, the black racer, scarlet king snake, garter snake, Cuban amole lizard, geko lizard, and the Cuban tree frog.

In summary, West Lake amount to an island of nature in a sea of urban development. As wetland, it is temporarily protected by existing law from further development without permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. However, waste and run-off from adjoining developed areas continue to have an adverse impact and it is the feeling of most concerned environmentalists in Broward County that the land should be in the public domain to insure its preservation in a natural state.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE POZNAN RIOTS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is a source of pride to everyone of Polish heritage. Since the Second World War, Poland has lived under the oppression of a Communist regime. But throughout that time, the people of Poland have retained their desire for freedom and their fierce independence.

June 29 is the anniversary of a day which symbolizes the underlying resistance of the Polish people to their Communist rulers. On this day in 1956, industrial workers in the city of Poznan spontaneously rioted in the streets, demanding bread and freedom.

The revolt was quickly subdued: 53 people were killed and 200 wounded. But as a symbol of the underlying tension in Poland, the riots forced the Communist leaders into a broad alteration of the Polish Government. Press and religious freedoms were increased, farmers were no longer controlled by forced collectivization, workers were given a greater role in the management of industry. In sum, the Poznan revolt led to a greater independence for the people of Poland.

The riots symbolized to the world the struggle for freedom going on within Poland. It sparked resistance in Hungary which led to the anti-Communist revolution in that country.

Today the legacy of the Poznan riots lives on. On this, the 21st anniversary of the revolt, we are drawn to remember the courage of those individuals who fought for their country's freedom.

THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR IS A NECESSITY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the debate over this Nation's energy problems has been continuous since the 1973 Arab oil embargo with few significant decisions and none that have offered this Nation a secure energy supply for the future.

We need clean energy at a price Americans can afford.

The reserves of oil and natural gas are limited. No matter what they are, they are being exhausted rapidly.

In spite of this, the administration would like to delay the only technically mature solution to the energy shortage. They suggest that we wait until most of the oil is gone before making a decision to build the Clinch River breeder reactor. They discuss energy reserves in terms of supply, not in terms of the price people will have to pay for that energy.

The OPEC nations exert tremendous influence over the pocketbooks of U.S. citizens. This Nation's most unfavorable balance of trade, in its entire history, occurred the first quarter of this year. This unfavorable balance is a direct result of our increasing petroleum imports from the OPEC nations.

Even uranium, the fuel of present-day nuclear powerplants is limited. According to the January 1977 ERDA report, the recoverable uranium resources was estimated at 0.8 million short tons—known resources; 1.0 million short tons—probable resources; and 1.9 million tons—speculative resources. The National Academy of Sciences has assessed the probability that our resources are actually equal to or greater than the speculated amount, at only 3 percent. Disregarding this minimal probability, Dr. Schlesinger, the President's Energy Adviser, uses this speculative amount of uranium to delay the construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor.

In contrast to this, a group of six independent geologists in a study now in progress for the National Academy of Sciences have selected the 1.8 million short tons of known plus probable resources as a prudent planning base.

At present, the United States has stockpiled, in three locations, the equivalent energy of one trillion barrels of oil. This energy is in the form of uranium-238 which is the waste product of the uranium enrichment process. This is also equal to 700 years of electrical power production at the rate electricity was consumed in the United States in 1976. While the administration asks for conservation, and I agree we should stop wasting energy, they do not want to use this stockpiled energy. The breeder reactor can put this present waste uranium to work for us in 25 years if we continue to gain experience in generating power from breeder reactors. That is what the Clinch River breeder reactor will demonstrate.

In the face of these facts, the Clinch

River breeder reactor is a necessity and should be supported by all Members of Congress.

CLEAN AIR

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House voted to permanently relax the automobile emission standards first established in 1970. In so doing, it chose to condemn the next generation of Americans to hundreds of thousands of excess cases of respiratory disease caused by automobile. The House also adopted a provision which would significantly weaken the protection we sought to provide our Nation's national parks. The amendment adopted on the floor will allow, as Representative ROGERS pointed out during the debate, the construction of a new city of a half million people on the lip of the Grand Canyon. The House amendment would effectively permit significant deterioration of air quality in those areas of the country where the air is cleaner than the law requires.

George Will, the Pulitzer prize-winning columnist, has recently reviewed these two issues. House and Senate conferees will shortly begin their work on the Clean Air Act amendments. I believe it is important that as we work toward an agreement, we keep in mind what is really at stake in the Clean Air Act: the health of the American people, and their ability to continue to enjoy, for generations to come, their pristine recreation and wilderness areas.

I wish to commend Mr. Will's column to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1977]
ANOTHER SETBACK IN THE QUEST FOR CLEAN AIR

(By George F. Will)

It is a moment for unminced words. If the House of Representatives gets its way with amendments to the Clean Air Act of 1970, Congress will have chosen to increase the incidences of various respiratory ailments. And it will have committed a retrograde act against the nation's natural beauty.

Three times since 1970 Congress has delayed implementation of automobile emissions standards. Now the House has voted a fourth delay. Worse, it has voted to weaken standards for carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide, and has created a mechanism for indefinite weakening of even the weakened nitrogen oxide standards in the future. The Senate has voted for less delay, and for no weakening of carbon monoxide standards. Furthermore, although the Senate has voted to weaken nitrogen oxide standards, it has not provided a mechanism for indefinite weakening.

To some extent, society chooses its disease rates. Societies, like individuals, constantly choose between health and competing goals and pleasures. The House has made an unacceptable choice against the health of Americans who breathe.

For example, the House would allow a fivefold increase in nitrogen oxide emissions over what would be required under existing law. About 40 percent of nitrogen oxide pollution comes from vehicles, and the percentage is substantially higher in urban areas. Such pollution may produce the carcinogenic

(cancer-causing) chemicals called "nitroamines."

The automobile industry says it does not know how to meet the present, unrevised standards. But the industry has a dismal record of asserting what can't be done, and an admirable record of doing what it is forced to do. The lash of necessity concentrates the mind.

Automobiles should be the focus of the fight for clean air because they are the most pervasive source of pollution. And it is easier to shape the decisions of four automobile companies than it is to deal with scores of thousands of fuel-burning industries. But advocates for the automobile industry say that unless pollution standards are relaxed, jobs will be lost because automobile prices will rise unreasonably, and production may be disrupted.

The House bill is an attempt to secure jobs at the expense of the health of millions, especially children and the aged. But more permissive automobile pollution standards will be an obstacle to industrial growth in many areas.

Where pollution already is the maximum permitted, only a decrease in automobile pollution can make possible increased industrial pollution. So the House bill sacrifices other industries, as well as the breathing public, to the automobile industry.

Some advocates for the automobile industry seem to have learned their science from the tobacco industry. They argue that there is little "scientific proof" of the connection between automobile pollution and particular diseases. Such arguments deny the undeniable: statistical patterns that demonstrate a correlation between high pollution and heart disease rates.

The House bill is especially unacceptable, given President Carter's energy program. Carter's plan to substitute coal for oil means increased nitrogen oxide pollution from stationary sources. So a compensatory decline in automobile emissions is imperative.

Another provision of the House bill, if it survives the House-Senate conference, would justify a veto. If enjoyment of natural beauty is, as I believe, important to the serenity of one's soul, then the House bill jeopardizes the nation's spiritual as well as physical well-being. It undoes the policy that prevents "significant deterioration" of the air in several categories of clean-air regions.

The House did this to permit construction of a gigantic coal-fired generating plant in Utah to provide power for Los Angeles. The plant would be near Capitol Reef National Park, not far from Bryce Canyon and near enough to Arches and Canyonlands National Parks to cast haze over them on many days. And this House provision threatens all national parks and wilderness areas where air is supposed to be preserved in its natural pristine quality.

This provision might mean a dramatic decline in scenic values. Rep. Paul Rogers (D-Fla.) says it would be the pollution equivalent of putting a city of 500,000 next to a national park. Rep. Bob Eckhardt (D-Tex.) dryly suggests that "it will be difficult to tell which of our mountain ranges should be called the Great Smokies."

To govern is to choose, and to choose is to reveal values. If the House gets its way, we shall have glimpsed a dark future.

MAJ. BUSTER GLOSSON
REASSIGNED

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to report to the House that

next month the Armed Services committees will be losing the services of an extraordinary young officer in the office of the Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison, Maj. Buster Glosson is being reassigned to attend the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Va.

The chance to attend this prestigious military graduate school represents a significant milestone in the career of an officer, and certainly Major Glosson deserves such an opportunity. Yet, I cannot help but reflect on how difficult it is going to be for General Blanton and the Air Force to fill his shoes after the job he has done, not only for the Air Force and the Congress, but for our country over the past 3 years.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Buster Glosson during that period and I can only say that he personifies all the things that are right about today's Air Force. He exemplifies the quality of leadership present in the Air Force today and typifies the "can do" spirit and technical competence necessary to get a vital job done. Even while functioning as a spokesman for the Air Force, Major Glosson has managed to retain the kind of objectivity necessary to provide unbiased information for the use of the Congress. Buster is an officer who understands that his mission in Air Force legislative liaison is to serve two matters equally well—the Air Force and the Congress.

I have traveled all over the world—from Somalia to Japan—on committee business with Major Glosson and I can tell you that his efficiency and expertise are going to be sorely missed by those of us who came to rely on him so heavily during our travels.

I hasten to add, however, that I intend to follow his career closely in the future because the Congress loss is my gain. In his new assignment, Major Glosson will be a constituent of mine. And I expect I will continue to hear great things about my friend, Buster Glosson.

CONGRESSMAN PEPPER'S REMARKS PERCEPTIVE AT FSU COMMENCEMENT

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, recently my distinguished colleague and good friend from Florida, Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, was the keynote speaker at commencement exercises for the 1977 graduating class of The Florida State University in Tallahassee.

His remarks were extremely perceptive and especially appropriate in this day and age of challenge. Congressman PEPPER, a former U.S. Senator who has served the State of Florida in various public offices since 1929, was made an honorary alumnus of The Florida State University. He is a long-time supporter of FSU and visited its campus on many occasions.

I feel his thoughtful comments will be of benefit to all the Members of this

body. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to share Congressman PEPPER's remarks with you.

They are as follows:

COMMENCEMENT SPEECH

President Silger, Reverend Clergy, Members of the Board of Regents, Chairman of the Board, members of the Faculty, members of this great graduating class of FSU of 1977, families, friends, ladies and gentlemen. I was delighted to hear that very excellent speech by Miss Brewster and I predict that she'll either be a professional leader of the ERA or faculty leader or member of the legislature or member of Congress or maybe the first lady governor or president, before very long.

Thank you very much President Silger for those kind words of introduction. Particularly I thank you for the honor and the pleasure you give my wife and me to share the delight and the inspiration of this occasion, as it were, to attend the going away part for a lot of great people who are about to embark upon long, challenging, and eventful adventure; the voyage of life.

While we here are concerned primarily about the problems of institutions of higher learning, I heard a problem the other day that took place at the secondary level in the public school system. One morning a son said to his mother, "Well I'm not going to school today." The mother said, "What do you mean you're not going to school today?" "Well," he said, "Those kids out there don't like me and I don't like them either." The mother said, "Well that hasn't got anything to do with it." You are going to school today and I'll tell you two reasons why you are. The first is: you're forty-seven years old; and the second is: you are the principal of the school."

Well yesterday there was a great event which took place on this campus, meaningful not only for Florida State University, but for the cause of higher education in this state and nation—the installation of Dr. Silger as the new president of this great institution. Now I heard a little new slant upon the duties and the attitudes of presidents of universities the other day when the presidents of the independent colleges and universities of Florida came up to Washington and had a luncheon with our delegation in the Congress. And one of those presidents told this story: He said, one day in a religious oriented institution a professor asked one of the students who tore down the walls of Jericho. The student indignantly replied, "Well I didn't do it, why do you pick on me?" Well the poor professor was so taken back that he pondered over the matter for a bit and decided that maybe he'd tell the dean about it. And he did. The dean didn't seem to be too much responsive to the inquiry, so the professor decided he'd go tell the president about it. So he sought out the president and he said, "Mr. President, I thought you ought to know about this episode that occurred in one of my classes the other day. I asked a student who tore down the walls of Jericho and he indignantly replied, 'Well I didn't do it, what do you pick on me for.' The president said, 'Professor, who was that student?' He said, 'It was Jim Smith.' The president said, 'Now listen Professor, I know Jim Smith and I know his family and if he told you he didn't do it, he's telling you the truth.' The president added as the poor professor was about to go away, 'But listen, Professor, see if you can get hold of this fellow Jericho, tell him I am mighty sorry about all the trouble he's had with his wall, and if there is anything I can do to help him tell him just to let me know.'"

Well, it is an exciting experience that you've been having in the years that you have been in lower grades, in High School—now in this university. You are receiving your degrees from this institution, many of them

graduate degrees. Those have been meaningful years to you. They've been years of competition, of character building, years of experimentation, years of a considerable amount of adventure, years when you've been poking into all kinds and forms of knowledge to which man has been heir in his long past. You've had the guidance of learned men and women to aid you in that search. You've begun to get the feel of knowledge and you've begun to take on the consciousness and the responsibility of one who has to live a life, and perform the duties of a member of the human race.

Now you are just about to depart upon the greatest adventure of all, the one for which you've been so long preparing, to which you have so long, so anxiously looked forward. Well, the kind of a world into which you are about to embark—you don't need to be told by me—is a very challenging world, a very competitive world, a very enigmatic world in many respects, and one that is constantly going through kaleidoscopic change and variation. In fact I heard my wife's minister the other day say that a man born in 1900, as I was, had more in common with Plato and Aristotle than he does with his grandchildren. So, since most of you are about the age that my grandchildren would be, I suppose I am expected to be looking out here vacuously and wondering who all you strange people are that I see out there in front of me. Perhaps you are looking up here and saying, "What is that standing before us making those strange noises?"

Well, it is true that in my lifetime the world has been completely changed from what it was when I was born. Dr. Silger was kind enough to mention the visit of some of the members of your faculty to my office in Washington. There are two pictures on my office wall that, to a rather dramatic degree, emphasize the change which has occurred in our world in my lifetime. While I was in the Senate, one day, Orville Wright, the first man to fly an airplane in human history, came unannounced into my office and very humbly asked me if I would introduce a bill for the Congress to declare his birthday, August the 19th, as National Aviation Day. I told him, of course, I'd be honored to do so. I got the bill through the Congress, the president signed it, issued the proclamation. A couple of days later, Mr. Wright came back and from an envelope that he had under his arm, he pulled forth a picture and handed me a photograph of that first human flight in a heavier than air craft at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, in 1903, autographed to me by him. I have that picture proudly displayed. But just above that, I point out to my visitors, is an autographed photograph from some of the astronauts who went from Florida and walked on the moon and returned to Florida. Many men did that before the end of the sixties. That too occurred in my lifetime. So in my lifetime, Man's ability to get off of the ground—to transverse the air—has increased from a few hundred feet and a few seconds above the sand dunes of North Carolina to walking on the Moon and coming back to tell the story to Florida and the world. And that's just symbolic of the change that is likely to occur in your lifetime. It challenges the fertility of your imagination. So that if you were to write down a description of the world you now know and show it to your grandchildren, they would, no doubt, be amazed at the relatively obsolete, archaic times when you came to your full maturity.

Well, there are a lot of things to do in that new world upon which you are about to embark. We still haven't found the cause and cure of cancer or heart disease. People still gasp their life away seeking to breathe with the infliction of emphysema. There are many other disabilities and limitations from which humans suffer. Maybe one of you will find the answer to some of these problems—will be the one who offers hope, where today only despair can be found in the hearts of those

who suffer. So there will be many challenges for you to face.

One of the things that I would urge you to do is to concern yourself about the peace of the world. A few days ago, all over America, people huddled under our great flag listened to taps which honored our patriotic dead, and pledged eternal fidelity to their memory. But, if we could honorably have avoided war, those precious lives could have been saved and they would not be a lost asset to this and to other generations. I do not say a peace at any price, but a peace which rests upon strong military and economic power in our country; a peace resting upon the best institutions and organizations that man can devise for the solution of the problems of mankind; a peace related to the progress, the economic well-being of all people who belong to the human race; a peace based upon better understanding among people. My wife and I, returning with a congressional delegation from Australia a bit ago from an international conference, stopped for a little while in Taipei, in Taiwan. Attending the one breakfast while we were there were about a half a dozen members of the American Congress and about half a dozen outstanding businessmen of Taipei and Taiwan who were all Christians. We talked about our religious experiences in our own churches, and finally we told about the satisfaction we derived from our old hymns which are part of our faith and our services. Well, one of our members was a good harmonica player, a fellow from Texas named Jake Pickle. He brought out his harmonica, we refreshed our memories of the words of *Amazing Grace* and *Bless Be the Tie that Binds* and here in far away Taipei half a dozen American Congressmen and half a dozen Chinese businessmen sat around the table and to the tune of a harmonica sang *Amazing Grace* and *Bless Be the Tie that Binds*. I couldn't help but think that if we could just get all the people of the world singing old hymns, getting to know one another, exchanging views, talking about one another's problems, it would be one of the best ways to bring and preserve peace for mankind.

Now let me say a word to you individually. Many of you will achieve outstanding success—money, fame, distinction. Many of you will know some of the best and greatest satisfactions of life. All of you will perhaps not be fortunate enough to have that good success; but I want to tell every one of you that you can be an important person in the human race, in your country, in your state, in your community. You can be a meaningful individual. You can be a success. You have it within your own power to do it. Now what do I mean by that? I heard a minister the other day say, "Be ashamed to die until you have won a victory for mankind." Then he asked the question, "Who is your hero?" and the next question, "What kind of a hero are you to others and will you be to those who follow after you?" Have you already learned that it is important just to be a great person as well as to achieve success that men esteem and envy. Not a single human being lacks the capacity—certainly one who has had your great advantages, belongs to your preferred class intellectually, possesses your knowledge of the past, has your capacity to divine much of the future—to make a valuable contribution to everything that transpires in the annals of man, community wise, state wise, nationally, and in the world. You can be the kind of person whom neighbors will feel comfortable with; whom friends will cherish; upon whom they can depend. President Johnson used to describe a man that was a dependable friend as a man you could go to the well with, a man who could go with you into the darkness of the night and would stand by you if an attack occurred.

I mean by that you've now had the education that Dr. Robert Manard Hutchins spoke

about; the primary concern of which is to teach you how to educate yourself the rest of your life. Now you have the tools of knowledge within your use and grasp—an enormous power to exercise in the counsels of men, perhaps of nations. In order to be—and too often in America in the long past, we have put too much emphasis on getting, rather than being—but in order to be a well rounded human being, reflecting credit upon self, family, school, college, and country, one needs to have that comprehensive grasp of the values of life which you have acquired here and which has been a part of your education.

I don't know of any better description of a well rounded man or woman than that definition of a liberal education given by Huxley when he said, "I consider that man to have had a liberal education whose body has been so trained in his youth that it does with ease and pleasure the work that as a mechanism it is capable of; one whose intellect is a clear, cold logic engine with all of its parts of equal strength and in smooth running order, ready like the steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, to spin the gossamers as well as to forge the anchors of the mind; one whose mind is stored with the knowledge of the vast and fundamental laws of nature and the laws of her operation; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; one who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all selfishness, to put away all villainies, and to respect others as himself. Gentlemen, I hope the well rounded man will become your hero, the one whom you will attempt to emulate. Ladies, I hope the well rounded woman will be your ideal, the one you will try to emulate.

Now, in conclusion, let me pass on to you something that I heard in 1921 from a professor at the University of Richmond, who delivered the Phi Beta Kappa address at the University of Alabama, where I was a graduate. I've never forgotten those words that that professor uttered. It was a benediction and I pass it on to you in the same spirit as that in which he transmitted it to us. He said that in the ancient days when the Scandinavians, those hearty people of the North, were about to set sail from their home shores upon their long and adventurous voyages, they gathered, before they entered upon their boats, up upon the sea-shore, surrounded by their loved ones and friends bidding them good-bye. Their minister was there and when the moment of departure came, the minister stretched his hands over their heads and said, "May the Lord bless thee and keep thee. Grant thee favoring winds, a prosperous voyage, safe harbors, and stout hearts for the storms."

Thank you.

NEW YORK STATE TO JOIN OTHER STATES IN DECRIMINALIZING MARIJUANA

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that last night the New York State Senate approved legislation to reduce to a civil fine the penalty for possession of small amounts of marijuana. Governor Carey, who was the major force in pushing this legislation through the legislature, is expected to sign the legislation into law shortly. This meas-

ure is an important victory for those of us who have been working for reasonable marijuana laws which earn the respect of the public. New York becomes the ninth State to enact marijuana law reform.

I believe that it is important that this issue be addressed at the national level. I am sponsoring legislation, H.R. 432, which would reduce to a civil fine of up to \$100 the penalty for possession of up to an ounce of marijuana in Federal jurisdictions. In hearings before the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control in March, the Carter administration expressed support for decriminalization.

Some argue that our marijuana laws are honored in the breach and that there is no real urgency to change the laws, as they affect only a small number of people. A recent study by the New York State Division for Criminal Justice Service indicates that in New York law enforcement resources are being wasted in arresting those possessing small amounts of marijuana. The study states that in 55 of the State's 62 counties—excluding New York City—between 73 and 99 of every 100 drug arrests was for possession of marijuana. (New York City records show that between 40 and 63 of every 100 drug arrests involved possession of marijuana.)

Division chairman Frank Rogers, as quoted in today's Daily News made the point that police were not concentrating on pursuing drug traffickers. He said,

The new statistics belie the notion that the state's law enforcement agencies are concentrating their arrest energies on marijuana sales: 24,192 or 83.5% of all marijuana arrests were for possession.

It makes little sense to mar the lives of many otherwise law-abiding young people by arresting them and giving them criminal records for simple possession of small amounts of marijuana. I am delighted that New York has seen fit to correct that inequity, and I hope that the Congress will soon follow.

PRESIDENTIAL IMAGE BUILDING

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following column by my constituent, Gen. Henry Huglin. General Huglin is a retired Air Force brigadier general and syndicated columnist. He comments on President Carter's efforts to build his image at home and abroad.

The article follows:

PRESIDENTIAL IMAGE BUILDING

(By Henry Huglin)

As most new Presidents, Jimmy Carter is working to build his leadership image at home and abroad.

This image-building has been particularly important for him. He has not long been widely known in this country, and even the election campaign resulted in many ambivalent feelings about him. Also, he was little known abroad when he took office.

So far, he has proved to be a skilled image-builder. This is good and important, be-

cause much hinges on the way people at home and abroad assess our President. But he still has some way to go to establish a clear image based on solid accomplishments.

A good presidential image is dependent on proved leadership. And leadership is dependent on such things as earned trust and the public's feelings about character, wisdom, integrity, skill, and coolness and tough-mindedness in crises.

Domestically, an image of respected leadership in a President can have major effects on such things as the mood, confidence, and dynamism of our country.

And the success which Mr. Carter achieves in gaining the confidence of the public will affect the clout he will have with the Congress on the differences and confrontations they are bound to have.

When a President doesn't have a strong image, Congress will often buck him in over-asserting its prerogatives and sometimes intruding into the President's prerogatives. And our system seems to work best when a President has an edge on the Congress but does not dominate it.

In his conduct of national security affairs, including his highly important role of Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces, the degree to which Mr. Carter achieves public confidence in his judgment will be a vital factor.

In foreign affairs the President has to conduct our diplomacy, through his representatives and directly at times with other nations' leaders. But he also has to get Congress' support on many issues, including economic and military aid, policy on arms sales abroad, and ratifying treaties, such as the new ones being negotiated on the Panama Canal and on strategic arms limitations.

Further, the support Mr. Carter gets from Congress and the public will be a major element in his effectiveness in diplomacy and in dealing with crises abroad.

This is especially true in dealing with the Soviets, which is one of the most important areas of foreign and national security affairs. What counts greatly with the Soviets and our other adversaries—and indeed with the leaders of other nations as well—is the evident backing of the President by the people and by Congress.

Of course, an initial factor in strengthening or eroding a President's credibility and image is the degree of his carrying out campaign pledges.

Mr. Carter has made much—probably too much—over fulfilling what he pledged in the campaign. Yet, some of what he pledged cannot prudently be carried out, and therefore should not be, in light of the circumstances he now faces in office.

The pledged out of \$5 billion or more in the defense budget is a case in point. It has not been carried out, because it would have been foolhardy and irresponsible to do so, in light of the Soviets' on-going heavy military buildup and hard-nosed attitude in the strategic arms limitation talks.

President Carter is apparently finessing some of his unfulfilled promises, which is the sensible thing for him to try to do. This is expected by most of us of most politicians. But it is harder for him to do, because of the emphasis he made during the election campaign and early this year about carrying out all his promises.

There will likely be some disillusionment and flak over his over-promising and under-fulfilling. However, his image will not suffer long or appreciably if, in important domestic and foreign areas, he shows his competence and worthiness of trust, by virtue of demonstrated wisdom, good sense, sound judgment, and decisiveness—which he has yet fully to demonstrate.

So far, President Carter can be given high marks for his image-building efforts. He has made a generally favorable impression on the majority of Americans and on foreigners as

well. But he still has to produce solid accomplishments—substance beyond style—and perform well in crises.

Regardless of our party affiliations, we ought to hope that Jimmy Carter does prove to be a strong, wise, and trusted President, because so much for all of us depends on whoever is President being so.

Of course, we still ought to feel free to criticize him when we feel he deserves it. But our criticism ought to be constructive, designed not to carp but to influence him in performing more effectively on behalf of all of us.

WILL TO WIN: VITAL ELEMENT TO VICTORY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Americans who fought in the Korean and Vietnam wars had great feelings of frustration. The one ingredient that is built into American life and particularly American sports was missing: the will to win. In both wars, American soldiers were stage managed. In Korea we arbitrarily stopped advancing after a so-called truce line was set up. In Vietnam we were never really allowed to hurt the enemy. In both wars, the enemy enjoyed sanctuaries and certain airfields and other targets were off limits to our bombers.

With this sort of managed conflict being very alien to our traditions, naturally great discontent arose among the fighting men and the general population during both conflicts setting up opportunity for subversive elements, which they did not fail to exercise. In both wars, we lost men, equipment and equally as important, morale in the process. Never again should American fighting men be sent into a no-win war. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Gatsis, retired, an officer with considerable combat experience, recently wrote on the subject of "will to win" in the April 1977 issue of Army magazine. I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues:

WILL TO WIN: VITAL ELEMENT TO VICTORY
(By Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Gatsis, U.S. Army, Retired)

The furor generated today by public officials and some senior military men over the status of American defense posture is creating an aura of uncertainty about national security and has so clouded the issue that ordinary citizens do not know what to believe.

This confusion stems, in part, from a lack of understanding by the average American as to what are the elements essential to making up military power capable of victory. It is further aggravated by those legislators and officials who, for various reasons, feel that our defense posture must be downgraded.

It is understandable that most congressmen and government civilian officials are not experts in this field and, consequently, cannot appreciate as readily as military professionals the real meaning of defense. Not easily understood and certainly inexcusable is the fact that many do not care whether they know what constitutes a credible defense and place more importance on other issues less vital to our survival, such as pro-

viding economic aid to countries inimical to the United States.

In any event, it is the solemn duty of our senior military officials, who have sworn to defend the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, to assure that those responsible for our national security know what makes a winning capability and to warn the American people of our Achilles' heel.

Instead, many play follow-the-leader with Congress and their civilian superiors, focusing predominantly on the military budget, the size of our combat forces, their combat readiness and requirements for weapons systems.

Certainly these considerations are absolute necessities for the development of military force, but they by themselves do not satisfy the demand for ultimate military victory.

As a result, the American public is misled to believe that acquiring proficiency in these areas alone keeps U.S. security intact. Nothing could be further from the truth, for military success results from a combination of many things.

In addition to superior weaponry and high-quality, trained personnel, which we hear so much about today, other factors which influence the outcome of military conflict are leadership, sound strategy, battlefield environment, the enemy's capability, allied support, time needed to mobilize, some luck and, most of all, the will to use power.

Usually, one of these factors is more dominant than the others, but none is as important as the last. A case in point is the momentum of Allied forces in World War II. Our overwhelming number of weapons and men combined with an uncanny wartime production capability overpowered the enemy. Under these circumstances momentum canceled out the need for highly qualified personnel. The hurry-up training cycles recruits underwent were ample proof of this.

Another extremely important element overriding many of the others, which greatly contributed to the favorable outcome of the war, was the advantage of adequate mobilization time—a benefit which will not be enjoyed in the future if we wait for the commencement of hostilities before developing the framework for rapid transition into full military potential.

However, if this power of the United States and its Allies had not been exercised with sufficient intensity, victory in World War II could not have been realized, even though all of the vital ingredients mentioned for success were present.

The Vietnam and Korean wars are striking examples of failure because of the timidity with which we used force available to us. The same essential subsystems for success were in our favor: ample manpower, much better trained than the American fighting men of World War II; weapons and firepower, in the main far superior to those of the enemy.

There was no shortage of military leadership and plenty of time to build up our forces. Production capability clearly surpassed that of our adversaries and the environment, as an obstacle, was easily overcome by an airmobile capability and complete control of the air space over the battle zone.

Yet, we failed to gain a decisive victory in Korea and lost the war in Vietnam because we did not have the fortitude to use that necessary force at the right place. There were many ways U.S. might could have been applied.

An example of a concept offered and rejected was to launch a ground offensive in North Vietnam and attempt to starve the country into submission by bombing the dikes and flooding their rice paddies.

Instead, we spent billions of dollars in Vietnam by bringing overwhelming firepower

into play defensively and applying air strikes in North Vietnam with such restrictions that they were totally ineffective. Needless to say, the tremendous cost of these fruitless operations was bad enough, but there were also the lives of our pilots and crews that were lost for the sake of missions not designed to break the back of the enemy.

In the south, our troops were continuously wasting billions of rounds of ammunition by firing into areas in which there was no intelligence to confirm enemy presence. This was known as "reconnaissance by fire."

There were even such extremes as making air strikes with 500- and 750-pound bombs against a lone sniper hidden in the jungles. It was like killing ants with a hammer. On top of this travesty, the U.S. Army was told by government officials that, since the military phraseology "search and destroy" for counterinsurgency operations sounded too horrible to the American public and the world, all references for such maneuvers would have to be expressed in more docile terms, such as "search and clear."

This was hardly a catalyst for motivating the fighting spirit of the American soldier. Placed in this position by their own government, the armed forces were compelled, for a lost cause of our own making, to wage war in the most inefficient and costly way possible.

The Chinese communists, who supported the North Vietnamese, put it very aptly in the Peking Review when they said, "Throughout the Vietnam war, the U.S. troops have become famous in the history of war as an army which spends the most money, wastes the largest quantity of ammunition and launches operations which constitute the heaviest drain on manpower and material resources."

National security cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents; neither can it be measured alone in terms of weapons, ships, aircraft and manpower. Something more is needed for winning—something that will cost nothing and will in the long run save lives.

To ignore this most basic and critical principle of all, resolution to apply needed force, places the United States on the brink of disaster. To wield power in military operations overrides all other considerations related to a credible defense, for if we do not exercise force when the time comes, why have it at all?

Obviously, if we demonstrate reluctance to take strong action when it is called for, U.S. credibility diminishes in the eyes of its enemies as well as it allies, and our deterrent effect, so often relied upon for preserving peace, becomes latent and ineffectual.

My concern is that public officials today are so enmeshed in the ABCs of what makes up a defense posture that they lose sight of the most important facet of all—development of a strong policy for full utilization of force when required.

Do not confuse this policy requirement with military strategy. If anything has not been neglected, it is strategy. To be convinced of this, one needs only to see the volume of global plans developed and constantly revised for all kinds of situations.

The irony here is that these plans are seldom valid when the time comes to implement them since conditions and circumstances change. Adopting such a policy also does not mean making a show of force by deploying a task group to the vicinity of confrontation with no intent to back it up if the need arises. This kind of action only fortifies the world's opinion of U.S. weakness in character.

The genuine requirement is a policy which will provide the responsible military commander with the authority to use that conventional force needed to win. He is the high priest of warfare and knows more of what

it takes to succeed on the battlefield than do his civilian superiors.

The opposing view will be, of course, that diplomatic or foreign policy considerations may preclude use of an exorbitant amount of force and that military action must be shaped around State Department policy. The shallowness of this position is quite apparent when it is recognized that the only reason the armed forces have been called to fight is that State Department policy has failed.

War is always the last resort for settling affairs of nations and is an instrument of policy. When this stage is reached, the fighting should be left to the experts and nothing spared to obtain victory. To say that war is too important to leave to the generals alone is like saying surgery is too risky to be left to the surgeons.

Make no mistake about it, I do not advocate the free use of awesome power when lesser means will suffice. But if we are going to fight, we had better do just that with the resolve to win. This means pull out all stops required for that ultimate victory.

Winning, obviously, demands adequate resources to do the job. It only follows then that requirements must be developed from a factual perspective. Statistics show that there are serious shortfalls across the board in our conventional forces.

U.S. military capability is at a lower ebb, in comparison with that of the Soviet Union, than it has ever been before. Even those who say our defense is strong talk only in terms of military sufficiency or parity, rather than military superiority. History clearly shows military supremacy, not parity, gives victory.

It is therefore, only logical, where precious commodities such as freedom and liberty are at stake, that we would want the best insurance coverage possible to keep from losing them.

Yes, we are in dire need of sophisticated weapon systems such as the B-1 bomber, the Trident submarine, a highly mobile tank with great battlefield reliability and other modernized equipment when our main adversary is closing the military gap on us quantitatively, qualitatively and in production capability.

We Americans have the ingenuity and professional knowledge for developing all of the essential ingredients for maximum military potential. With some luck and the will to use strength as required, the odds would be overwhelmingly in our favor to win. Courage to go all the way and a steadfast adherence to the axiomatic principle of reinforcing success rather than failure are mandatory for winning.

The use of power must be bold, but it must also be applied where it is needed. Wrong direction of this force will only hasten disaster. Vietnam is an excellent case of misapplied force. The armed forces, greatly expanded, brought tremendous power to bear upon the enemy, but reinforced failure by continuously fighting a defensive action in the South after reaping fruitless results for years with such tactics.

Continuous negative results only triggered a greater effort in applying those same old methods proved totally ineffective in the early years of the war: Never once was any meaningful attempt made to change the strategy and redirect the weight of our power toward the enemy's heartland, his war-making potential and his willingness to fight.

These targets could be found only in North Vietnam. The net consequence of clinging to this ludicrous concept of operations was an attrition effect which produced a defeatist attitude among Americans and sapped the will to fight of our own forces.

In the final analysis, our Waterloo lies not so much in the shortfalls of military hardware and adequate manpower, but is embedded in the failure to flex the muscle of our

military might when the time comes and direct it offensively at the heart and core of the enemy, with the objective of destroying him.

Failure to take these measures at the right time and in the right place or to use too little force on the right target will, surely, invite our own destruction.

Too many times we forget that history shows affairs of nations are not determined by almsgiving and goodwill toward men but by power and the will to use it. Is America not going to heed these lessons? Are we going to throw our freedom and liberties away, although we have the capability to meet all of the requirements for defending them?

Someone once said, "A nation that will not defend itself shall not survive and, furthermore, does not deserve to survive."

I believe most Americans have the desire to win and will fight for their country, accepting nothing short of victory, if their leaders will come forward with that strong leadership so badly needed today.

WILDLIFE SANCTUARY PLANNED OFF VIRGINIA

HON. PAUL S. TRIBLE, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues are aware, the Nature Conservancy has recently acquired 13 barrier islands off the eastern shore of Virginia in my district. I consider this a significant milestone in national efforts to preserve wildlife.

The Nature Conservancy, a private, nonprofit organization with headquarters in Arlington, Va., has, in acquiring these islands, created the largest privately managed wildlife sanctuary in the United States.

Because of the importance of this action, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Times:

WILDLIFE SANCTUARY PLANNED OFF VIRGINIA: NATURE CONSERVANCY ACQUIRES MOST OF THE LAND ON 13 ISLANDS NEAR THE STATE'S EASTERN SHORE

(By John C. Devlin)

The Nature Conservancy has announced acquisition of all parts of 13 islands along the Virginia coast for what it says will be the nation's largest privately managed wildlife sanctuary.

The Nature Conservancy, a private, nonprofit agency that has preserved more than 1.1 million acres in 1,800 projects in this country, Canada and the Caribbean, began acquiring the islands in 1969, when commercial developers planned to acquire the land. The sanctuary will be called the Virginia Coast Reserve.

The conservationists were aided in the acquisition by \$4.7 million provided by the Mary Flagler Cary Charitable Trust, another private nonprofit agency.

William D. Blair, chairman of the Conservancy, announced at its headquarters in Arlington, Va., that, while most of the islands would be open for such activities as nature study, surf fishing, hiking, photography, and bird watching, "our primary concern must be with the complex, dynamic natural system itself."

The islands serve as a barrier to protect the rich marshes in the state's Eastern Shore, which are essential to the development of

shellfish and other varieties for commercial and sport fishing. It has been estimated that 90 percent of the fish caught in the area are dependent at least part of their lives on the local marsh system.

Consideration was given to transferring the acquisitions to the state, Mr. Blair said, but the Conservancy, a private conservation organization chartered for scientific and educational purposes, decided to supervise the islands itself.

The islands, from the north to south along 45 miles of the Eastern Shore of Virginia, are: Metomkin, Cedar, Parramore, Revel's, Sandy, Hog, Rogue, Cobb, Godwin, Ship Shoal, Myrtle, Mink and Smith. With the exception of major portions of Cedar and small parts of Hog and Smith, the islands are owned entirely by The Nature Conservancy.

Mr. Blair said that the newly formed Friends of the Coastal Reserve would provide the \$50,000 a year needed to offset the cost of maintaining the islands, which are between one and eight miles offshore and can be reached only by boat.

The islands are noted for their large concentrations of more than 200 species of shore birds, sea birds, and migrating and wintering waterfowl and other species. Ten species of hawks find refuge on the islands, and include the endangered peregrine falcon, pigeon hawk, or merlin, and, the osprey.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS AT WORK

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, lately we have all been hearing a great deal of criticism about the medical profession. Way too many doctors are going into high-paying specialties and practicing in cities where there are plenty of doctors. While there may be enough doctors country-wide, there are many areas of the country, especially inner cities and rural areas where there are no doctors at all. In 1971, Congress instituted the National Health Service Corps to bring doctors in to medically underserved areas. The following article from the American Medical Association publication *American Medical News* concerns two young Corps members who are practicing in Greenwood, Wis., and shows how a pair of doctors with the support of a larger medical center can provide excellent care for an area which would otherwise be without a doctor. The Marshfield Clinic which provides support services for these two doctors also provides support services for a number of other Corps members in northern Wisconsin:

TWO MDs TAKE TIME OUT FROM ACADEMIA FOR PRACTICE EXPERIENCE

Halfway through the residency program, most young physicians wonder what they will do when their training is complete. The possibilities are exciting, but the responsibilities somewhat awesome.

The physician could apply for a fellowship and become a subspecialist, or join a group, or begin a solo practice. It is an important decision that will influence, even determine, an entire career, but it comes at a time when the physician is caught up in the rigorous demands of residency training and has little time for detached consideration.

Stuart Grossman, MD, met this challenge in an unusual way. He knew that he wanted to continue his studies in internal medicine, perhaps as a fellow in immunology, and thought that he would want to teach eventually.

Before committing himself to further study, however, he wanted some practical experience as a practicing internist. To gain that experience, he became a volunteer for the National Health Service Corps.

Today he and a friend of like mind, Thomas Rahilly, MD, are the service corps physicians of the Greenwood Clinic in Greenwood, Wis., a town of 1,000 some 140 miles north of Madison. The clinic also is served by Dr. Grossman's wife, Linda Grossman, MD, a pediatrician who splits her time between the clinic and mothering a nine-month-old daughter.

Dr. Grossman says the decision has been good professionally. "I had been offered a fellowship, but I wanted to spend a few years in actual practice before making that decision."

"I wanted to get away from the strong role models in medical schools, and I wanted some time away from the hectic pace of my residency. With more time for myself and practice experience, I thought I would be better able to decide what I really wanted to do."

Most National Health Service Corps physicians practice in designated medically underserved areas as part of an obligation to repay the federal government for support received through medical school.

Some physicians, like Drs. Grossman and Rahilly, volunteer for the corps to gain the benefits of an on-going practice without assuming the liabilities of setting up the practice themselves.

Dr. Grossman emphasizes that he and Dr. Rahilly did not want to practice in a randomly assigned site. They actively searched for one that would permit them to practice the medicine they had been trained to offer.

"We're both board-certified internists, and we wanted to practice as internists," he says. "We did not want to be responsible for delivering babies, setting bones, or assisting at surgery. We wanted to gain experience doing what we felt best qualified to do."

Greenwood meets their needs perfectly. Although it is a long way from Madison or Milwaukee, it is only 26 miles away from the Marshfield Clinic, a sophisticated center staffed by a 170-member subspecialist group. The clinic serves as an excellent referral source, and provides extensive laboratory backup.

At noon each day, a courier picks up samples for processing at the Marshfield Clinic. Results that suggest major problems are telephoned to Greenwood that afternoon. More routine results are written and returned the following day.

"We're practicing medicine in the way we were trained to," Dr. Grossman says. "We have the equipment we need, a staff that's a real pleasure to work with, and a mix of patient problems that have been professionally challenging."

Dr. Rahilly echoes Dr. Grossman's praise for the Greenwood site. "Most service corps sites don't have this kind of backup," he says. "I know I wouldn't be comfortable practicing medicine without the support we receive from Marshfield."

"I can work up patients with complex problems, and stay with them after admission to the clinic's hospital since we have staff privileges at Marshfield."

Dr. Rahilly says he joined Dr. Grossman as a service corps volunteer because he wasn't quite sure which direction to pursue after the residency program. "I was at a crossroads and not sure which way to turn," he says.

"Then I thought what could be better than to gain practice experience. I wanted to see

how I would like it. Now I've been accepted for a fellowship in nephrology in Denver for next year, but I've learned that I don't want to get locked off in a subspecialty area. I'll always want to keep up a practice in general internal medicine."

Both physicians are gratified by the new-found time they have. At last they are able to do some of the reading that had to be postponed while immersed in post-graduate study. They also are able to spend more time with their families. Each lives only minutes away from the Greenwood Clinic and is able to go home for lunch, and to pursue hobbies.

"The day of the solo general practitioner is past," Dr. Grossman says. "That physician had to devote 110% of his life to medicine. I don't think it was fair to the physician or the patient."

"I think physicians are more useful to their patients if they lead something like a normal life, if they read more, go fishing, or work in their gardens like their neighbors."

He adds that he and Dr. Rahilly work hard to continue their medical education, participating in grand rounds at the Marshfield Clinic, sharing information on difficult cases, and attending at least one medical meeting each year.

The Greenwood experience represents a dramatic change in lifestyle for the physicians. Dr. Grossman was born and reared abroad, the son of an international economist. He was graduated from a high school in New Delhi, India, and completed undergraduate study at Harvard College. His wife attended Radcliffe, and from Cambridge the two traveled to Rochester, N.Y., completing medical school and residency programs at the U. of Rochester Medical School.

Dr. Rahilly was reared in southern Florida, did his undergraduate work at Columbia U., and went to the U. of Miami Medical School. He did his residency training at Rochester, where he met the Drs. Grossman.

All are pleased with small-town life, although they've sometimes started by the somewhat public nature of their life in Greenwood. "Patients will say, 'I see you cut your grass today,' and I'm often caught off guard," says Dr. Grossman. "I'm surprised that they would notice or care."

For their part, the townsfolk are delighted with the young physicians, says Dick Adler, co-ordinator of the clinic. "People say they're the nicest fellows," he says. "When they went in for physicals, they were gone over from top to toe, and felt they'd really been checked out. Word of that got around quickly."

Adler says people were puzzled at first by the fact that the physicians wouldn't set bones or deliver babies. "They figured that's what all doctors did," he says. "Now they're beginning to understand that they're specialists, and they don't mind the 30 minute drive to Marshfield for deliveries or emergency care."

The physicians do prenatal care up to the eighth month. Dr. Grossman says mothers understand when he explains that he wants an obstetrician to deliver the baby at the Marshfield facility in the rare event that a complication might develop.

Greenwood had been served for some 40 years by William Olson, MD, who decided a few years back that he wanted to retire. For a time the community, which includes some 15,000 people in a 15-mile radius, tried to get by with part-time physicians, volunteers from nearby Neillsville or Marshfield, who would take turns spending an hour or two per day at the Greenwood Clinic.

The community wanted to have another solo practitioner, but found it impossible to attract a physician. Finally, with help from physicians and others at the Marshfield Clinic, the community applied for and gained approval of their designation as a mentally underserved site.

After approval, the community pitched in to completely renovate the old clinic building, investing some \$50,000 in new facilities and equipment as well as time and physical labor by volunteers.

The renovated clinic opened last July when Drs. Grossman and Rahilly arrived. Dr. Rahilly will leave next year, having completed two years of service, and the Drs. Grossman will stay on for at least a third year.

Dr. Grossman says he will want to apply for a fellowship, but adds that his practice experience has helped clarify the area of further study.

"I was interested in immunology, but now I recognize that my interest was influenced more by role models than anything else. Now, after 10 months of practice, I will apply for a fellowship in pulmonary medicine."

"When you are a resident, the easiest thing to do is take a fellowship. It's not easy to leave the academic setting. The service corps offered another alternative, a way to get into private practice without the headaches of bookkeeping or getting set up. It's an alternative I'm glad I took."—James Stacey.

GI BILL TUITION EQUALIZER

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the years since the end of the Vietnam war, I have expended a great deal of time and energy in working toward the goal of identifying the special problems of the Vietnam-era veteran and then finding solutions to those problems.

In 1973, as cochairman of the Special Veterans Opportunity Committee of the National League of Cities/U.S. Conference of Mayors, I delivered a white paper report to the Congress and to the President on the recommendations of our committee on ways we could address the particular needs of this segment of our veteran population.

Since that time, too few of our recommendations have been heeded. But I want to speak today of only one of the problem areas our report addressed, an area with which I can personally identify. That is the problem our Vietnam-era veterans are having in utilizing GI bill education benefits.

As my colleagues may be aware, I received my college education under the GI bill after my service in World War II. But anyone who thinks that today's GI bill bears any relation to the program that saw and tens of thousands of returning soldiers through college in the 1940's and 1950's is just not familiar with the program. Therefore, today, I am introducing a bill that I think will begin to give the Vietnam-era veteran what his counterpart in World War II received. But more than that, the bill would not only put the veteran of this conflict on a more even par with his father's generation, it would put all veterans in this country on an equal footing.

In examining GI bill usage we have discovered that only 33 percent of eligible Vietnam-era veterans have taken advantage of GI bill benefits. But in looking further, it has become apparent that there are wide regional disparities in the percentages of use.

In California, the GI bill use rate is 52 percent; in Texas it is 37.4 percent; but in Massachusetts, it is 28.9 percent, and in Connecticut only 23.9 percent. These disparities are apparently resulting from differences in the cost of education from State to State, from region to region. In the Western and Southern States with extensive low-cost public 2- and 4-year college systems, GI Bill usage is relatively high. But in the Eastern and Midwestern States, which have traditionally relied on private colleges and smaller public systems, the percentage of usage falls.

The bill I am introducing today would provide a supplemental tuition allowance to veterans to offset State differences in educational costs. The amount of supplemental tuition allowance payable on behalf of any veteran for a school year may not exceed \$800 and would be computed by having the veteran pay the first \$400 of the tuition costs from his regular GI bill payment, with the Veterans' Administration paying 80 percent of the next \$1,000 of the tuition for the year to the educational institution.

While this bill does not duplicate the World War II program under which veterans received a subsistence payment and a separate tuition payment geared to the cost of the educational program they were pursuing, this measure will at least provide that our Vietnam-era veterans across the country, who were called upon to make the same sacrifices in combat abroad are given the same benefits in school at home. I believe we must give all veterans equal educational opportunities for equal military service and one way we can achieve that is through this tuition equalizer bill. I invite the cosponsorship of my colleagues.

INAUGURATION OF DR. CHARLES W. McQUARRIE

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest of pride that I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to my constituent, Dr. Charles W. McQuarrie, who is about to be inaugurated as president of the 20,100-member American Optometric Association.

Dr. McQuarrie is an outstanding citizen of Lancaster, Calif., who has worked diligently to serve the people of his community. Examples of his dedication to others include his years of service as president of the Lancaster YMCA; the Lancaster Kiwanis Club; the Antelope Valley Fair board of directors; and the Community Chest of the North Antelope Valley.

Now, Dr. McQuarrie is giving that same selfless service to the people of our country, as he assumes the leadership of an organization representing most of the optometrists in the United States.

On this important occasion in Dr. McQuarrie's public service career, I commend him for his past achievements and I encourage him in his future efforts to

lead his profession in finding new and more efficient ways to bring quality optometric care to all Americans.

GAS AT LOWEST PRICE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America is concerned with getting gas for the consumer at the lowest price. This is only possible through a deregulation, open market system. Here is why.

When a homeowner gets his gas bill it consists of 20 percent covering natural gas wellhead price and 80 percent is the cost of pipeline and distribution expenses. If the natural gas is not available, the other costs go right on. So the cost will be much higher unless the pipeline is kept full of gas coming from the well.

It has been estimated that natural gas will run \$1.95 mcf after deregulation. The alternative is importing natural gas which is shipped in a frozen liquefied state known as LNG which costs \$6 mcf.

Ninety-one percent of the energy in the United States will come the next 10 years from coal, oil, and gas. Oil and gas are the only commodities in the United States that are now under price control. Gas sells for half the Btu of coal and oil is three-fourths the price of coal. In order to change the emphasis of this country toward using more coal we must price oil and gas at the same level as coal.

Unless we go now to the open market, America should realize that we will have the same disaster that happened after our 1969 oil experience. In 1969, Congress raised our 21 percent oil import level to have more foreign oil come in at a price of \$1.80 to \$2.20 with domestic oil selling at \$3. Since then this price of foreign oil has increased to where it is now \$14.50 a barrel and we are now 55 percent dependent on imports on foreign oil. Instead of paying \$3 billion for our foreign oil imports as we did in 1969, we are exporting \$45 billion to pay for our foreign oil in the United States.

Take this \$45 billion over the next 8 years, and you can see it represents \$360 billion of American money that will go abroad. It should be spent in the United States on jobs, pipes, tanks, railroads, as American industry develops its own energy.

The great future for gas discoveries is in the deep wells with vast gas reserves. Only 1 percent of drilling last year was in the 15,000 foot and deeper wells. But these deep wells cost around \$2 million. It costs five times as much a foot to drill deep wells as it does shallow wells. And the deeper wells are very expensive. But once gas is a completed discovery, the life of these wells should run over 30 years.

There is no way the Government can classify every new well that produces and every industry cannot be assigned a priority. There is only one energy solution and that is to go to the open market and have America produce its own oil and gas.

**"YOUTH GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS"
OFFERS CONGRESS ADVICE ON
ENERGY**

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues an essay prepared by Michael Pizzuto, a young man from Cicero, Ill., who will be entering the University of Illinois this fall.

Michael has the proud distinction of being elected "Youth Governor of Illinois", by some 800 participants in the National YMCA Youth Governor's Conference, and has been spending some time in Washington, D.C., familiarizing himself with governmental problems and the legislative process on the national level.

His essay on energy shows a deep awareness of the problems facing our country and I am sure my colleagues will find it of interest:

CONSUMER CONTROLS

The nature of the pending energy crisis is of supreme importance, for our nation is truly in mortal danger. Our nations future shall depend on our ability to develop responsible, effective energy policies. If the nation fails to act on today's energy problem, government will be forced to impose strict controls, industry may face shut downs, and we shall experience a radical downgrading in living standards. Starting now we must provide incentives for developing our own energy resources and so that we may be adapted to changing circumstances that will help reduce our demands on the worlds limited supply of fuel.

The oil and gas that make up about three fourths of America's fuel were created in limited supply millions of years ago. At the rate we are consuming fuel we should deplete our sources around the year 2000, give or take a decade or so. Oil production will probably peak in the 1980's. There is no certainty that when our energy sources go into steep decline, power sources such as solar, thermonuclear fission, geothermal and derived fuels shall be available.

If the world's use of oil continues at present rates, it has been predicted, demand will exceed international production by the early 1980's. Just to remain even would require, "the production of a new Texas every year, an Alaskan North Slope every nine months, or a new Saudi Arabia every three years." The U.S. bill for imported oil increased from \$2.7 billion in 1970, to \$34 billion just last year. During the first two months of this year the U.S. imported \$6.5 billion worth in oil. This huge spending drains from the country badly needed purchasing power to create jobs.

Oil and gas production are obviously declining. Since the Arab oil embargo, our natural gas production is down almost 10 percent, while our coal has increased only about a disappointing 10 percent. Since the mid 1950's onward, 85 percent of the growth of the entire energy market was accounted for by the use of natural gas. This was caused because Federal Power Commission action has kept the price of natural gas attractively low.

The percentage of petroleum we import has increased from about 35 percent, at the time of the embargo, to about 43 percent at present. A lot more petroleum remains to be produced. Shale oil remains a researcher's dream and a problem for economists. More railroads have gone out of business and the situation in the Middle East remains un-

stable. The embargo was the cause of the loss of over a half million U.S. jobs and \$10 billion to \$20 billion in goods and services.

Coal production is up, but hardly up to expectations. The problem is not lack of coal. The U.S. has nearly half the world's deposits. According to experts, coal reserves will last anywhere from 90 to 400 years into the future. The hangup is that because of environmentalists' concerns, coal cannot be used in a widespread sense to bridge the sharp fall in energy.

Nuclear power as an alternative is also not faring for the better. Rapidly rising costs, and intense social objections have slowed production. Even alternatives such as solar, geothermal, wind power, and the rest, have been slow to appear. Environmentalists are concerned that an energy policy will be nothing more than a screen for business favoritism. Experts who have studied the question at length say that the energy efficiency of the U.S. is only about 10 percent.

Although we may develop a method of improved energy use, we will barely be able to meet the demands for energy in the coming decades. Basically, there are two feasible choices. The country can take the road that involves hard decisions, compromise, discipline, and acceptance of economic realities or it can go on the way it has until it is too late.

So that the people of our country can have adequate energy, environmental protection, and economic stability, we must create comprehensive energy policies. These policies must allow all people to aspire to, and strive for, a higher standard of living. An energy plan is needed for the future to avoid setting nation against nation and the regions of the U.S. against each other. If we demand responsible leadership from all our public officials and if we demand policies based on scientific facts, we can overcome the problems that face us today. Most of all we must demonstrate the same reliance, confidence, and good sense that we have demonstrated in helping build a better world.

Without an energy policy the end result will be economic, social, and political catastrophe, both at home and abroad. We cannot merely cut back on energy consumption. A thorough study has indicated that if we cut back energy production 2 percent by 1985 it could mean a loss of 900,000 jobs. If present energy consumption continues, our accustomed lifestyles could be in jeopardy. If we continue our do-nothing policies our dependence on oil exporting countries will increase. The U.S. could be placed in a politically dangerous spot of bidding for oil against our own allies.

Americans can't imagine what life might be like when the fuel starts running out. What can we do to prevent this now? Consumer controls will be the nation's biggest asset in planning to conserve our remaining reserves of energy for the future. Let us not find ourselves in the future saying, "If we had only started twenty years ago." Let's start now, before it's too late.

A WORD OF ADVICE ON RHODESIA

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of June 23 published a very outstanding letter to the editor, in my view, from the president of the Oxford University Monday Club, Mr. Oliver Ridgway Bloor. His subject was Rhodesia and he reminded the U.S. readers of some cogent parallels to the

short history of independent Rhodesia to those of our 13 colonies which rebelled against England in 1776. It can only be hoped that some of our "busy readers" on the African Desk at the Department of State read this letter. The item follows:

A WORD OF ADVICE ON RHODESIA

While the United States aids Britain and the African nations in seeking a peaceful settlement in Rhodesia, I think that it would be useful to point out that there is a historical precedent for this problem.

Some years ago, a crown colony (believing itself to be the victim of numerous injustices under imperial rule) made a unilateral declaration of independence. Britain applied military sanctions, but failed to regain the colony.

The regime then controlling the colony refused to institute universal suffrage for all races, and (unlike Rhodesia) permitted Africans to be held as the slaves of the (white) ruling class.

Last year, that country celebrated the 200 anniversary of its independence, but I did not notice any lack of enthusiasm for the celebrations on the part of those in the U.S. Government who are now trying to destroy one of the few non-Marxist governments left in Africa.

I do not ask the U.S. government to actively support Rhodesia's present constitution, but that it should not try to disrupt what may, in the future, become a fully democratic country—as the U.S.A. is now. Should Soviet-orientated guerrillas be allowed to gain control, then neither black nor white stands any chance of retaining either freedom or democracy in Rhodesia, and the Soviet stranglehold in central Africa will have tightened yet another notch.

OLIVER RIDGWAY BLOOR,

President,

Oxford University Monday Club.

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

GOD STILL PERFORMS MIRACLES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear that the age of miracles is past, that past miracles recorded in religious history were for a purpose but not really applicable in today's modern world.

Mr. Speaker, believe me, God works miracles in our lives today every bit as much as during those early time periods I mentioned earlier.

At about 7 a.m. 2 days ago, on the morning of Monday, June 27, my daughter-in-law Carol and my grandsons, Bradley and Adam, dropped off my son Terry at his job in the mountains of West Virginia.

As they usually do about once each week, they were to return home, prepare for a rather busy day and tend to the many items of family business that build up and require periodic attention.

Things were different this misty morning. Within seconds of starting down the mountain, all plans for that day were forgotten and put aside. For the next thing Carol realized was that the edge of the rain-soaked mountain road had given way and she and Bradley and Adam and their pickup truck were in

midair, falling to the bottom of the gorge, 100 feet straight down.

A miracle? Yes, they are alive today. When I received notification of this accident while here on the floor of the House Monday, Marian and I left immediately to be with them and our son.

That they survived is nothing but a miracle. The cliff they went over has walls that go straight down for at least 100 feet with no ledges or slope to break the fall. Their pickup truck was demolished. Carol and the boys found themselves on the ground, bleeding, bruised, hurt, scared, and confused, but alive.

Somehow, after 2 hours of slipping, sliding and falling—carrying two very young and very scared and very blood sons, Carol found her way to an old logging road. For some reason, one of the workers on Terry's job was 2 hours late coming to work and found them alongside the road. Why did he happen to be just 2 hours late on this particular day? That has to be part of the miracle, for otherwise they could have been lying alongside of that isolated road all day long.

Mr. Speaker, people are good and that morning, many good people did a lot of good things. With everything happening so fast, details became a little hazy, but Terry got Carol, Bradley, and Adam to the hospital 25 miles away, meeting the ambulance, which his coworkers had called by radio, on the way.

Although badly bruised and requiring many stitches, they will live with no permanent injury.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned the details of this accident, I thanked God over and over again because I know that they live today only because of His intervention. Even at this point however, I obviously had not realized the full impact of what had happened. Only yesterday, when I had the chance to stand on that lonely mountain road, peering down to the bottom of the gorge, seeing pieces of that pickup truck strewn about—and being so far away they looked like pieces of a child's toy—only then did the full impact of God's miracle hit me.

I am thankful Mr. Speaker that, whether we deserve it or not, our Lord does love us enough to allow us the benefit of His miracle. And if anyone ever tells you that miracles are a thing of the past, please ask them to let me tell them about the good news, that God still does perform miracles for us.

CONSUMER AGENCY ILL-ADVISED

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Oxnard Press Courier opposing the proposed Consumer Protection Agency. The article states good reasons to oppose this agency:

CONSUMER AGENCY ILL-ADVISED

President Carter wants more protection for the consumer. To this end, he has proposed establishing the Consumer Protection Agency and has called ill-advised opposition to the plan.

Carter claims the agency would not be a boondoggle as has been feared. He also says the agency would eliminate 13 other government offices and 180 jobs to enable a savings of \$10.4 million a year. If reorganization were all that mattered, Carter would have a point, albeit a shaky one, since the new agency would cost \$15 million in its first year.

But reorganization is not all that matters, nor, for that matter, is symbolism. Carter believes the new agency initially would have a psychological benefit.

Surely the President's pollster, Patrick Caddell, has something else to offer as a form of symbolism. This proposed consumer protection measure would be uncomfortably substantial once it became reality. The agency would be able to intervene in the way "regulations and decisions are made and carried out"; take part in "proceedings before federal agencies"; and horn into the affairs of other government agencies and private concerns.

This forebodes an unprecedented litigious future, one which Rep. Paul McCloskey has seen clearly. McCloskey tried vainly last month to get the House Government Operations Committee to redesign the agency so as to eliminate its power to sue other government agencies. McCloskey correctly labeled the prospect an "absurdity."

The agency is a bad proposal simply because it addresses the wrong problem. Government should be more concerned in this instance with the marketplace. The consumer already has plenty of protection.

The fewer the barriers to market entry and free competition, and the lesser the tax take on business, the more consumer interests are served. That in itself offers the consumer a ready form of protection. The difficulty with the proposed agency is that it is designed to concentrate exclusively on prices and not, as it should be designed, on the context in which those prices rise—the marketplace.

So, contrary to the President's urging, opposition to the Consumer Protection Agency is not ill-advised, it is necessary. The proposal is idling in Congress and should be allowed to die there.

PORNOGRAPHY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for June 29, 1977, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PORNOGRAPHY

Most Americans are outraged by pornography, but the Congress and the courts are just not sure what they can or should do about it.

There can be little doubt that America is entrenched in pornography. It has proliferated across the land. Many newsstands are a combination of smut shop and legitimate bookstore. Every major American city has a grubby area for sex shops, dirty bookstores, massage parlors, prostitution, and peek shows. In Washington such an area is only a few blocks from the White House. According to one national magazine, pornography is an ordinary topic of conversation in the suburbs and is "socially acceptable."

For well over a century Americans have

been anxious about pornography. What is it? What effect does it have on people? What can be done about it? The answers to these questions do not come easily, but a feeling is strong among many Americans that something has gone awry in our efforts to deal with it and the search for answers to it continues.

The Supreme Court has held that obscenity is outside the free speech protection of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, but the Courts and the Congress have had great difficulty in determining whether certain material is obscene. In 1957 in the Roth case the Supreme Court said what was sexual was not necessarily obscene and laid down the standard, "Whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interests."

In 1966 the Supreme Court went still further and said that to be obscene the material had to be "utterly without redeeming social value." This standard, which reflected a strong reluctance by judges to allow governmental interference with free expression, opened the flood gates of pornography, and in 1973 the Court, trying to reverse the tide, modified the Roth case with a test of obscenity based on three elements: (1) whether "the average person, applying contemporary community standards" would find that the work, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interests; (2) whether the work depicts or describes in a patently offensive way, sexual conduct specifically defined by applicable state law; and (3) whether the work taken as a whole lacks serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value.

The court indicated that the community standards could be local and not national. Since local juries would have to decide what offended their standard of taste, and convict violators if these standards applied, this was a much easier guideline for prosecutors. No longer was it necessary for them to show that a work was utterly without redeeming social value.

Even with that standard, pornography continued to flourish for several reasons: community standards were changing, police were arguing that pursuing perpetrators of victimless crimes represented a misuse of their limited resources, and legal procedures were cumbersome, expensive and often pointless because fines were light.

In recent years a large number of bills have been introduced in the Congress to protect the public from pornography. The major problem continues to be the difficulty of drafting legislation that would control pornography without violating First Amendment rights, as interpreted by the Supreme Court. The most successful legislation to date is an amendment to the postal laws to stop mailing of sexually oriented commercial advertisements to persons who indicate that they do not want to receive them. This law gives citizens some measure of protection against unsolicited sex mail. Hundreds of bills introduced in the Congress to protect people from unwanted pornography seek to include a broader class of material as obscene but the problem of how to define obscenity still remains. At the moment the Congress is giving a considerable amount of attention to legislation that would prohibit the manufacture or sale of pornography using children.

Another approach to dealing with pornography is through zoning laws to limit sex establishments—laws which have been upheld by the Supreme Court. The containment of these establishments seeks to protect the community and the individual from being confronted by offensive material. Many communities have learned that zoning can be a powerful tool in a community's arsenal to control pornography.

I recognize the dangers of limitations on the free dissemination of ideas, and I acknowledge the necessity of proceeding with utmost caution in developing any such limitations. In a sense, pornography is one of the prices we pay for genuine, free speech. I personally, however, object to the circulation of obscene material and will support in the Congress constitutional measures to stop the flow of it. Certainly immediate steps are needed to protect minor children and the majority of Americans must be able to associate with one another without unwillingly being contaminated by pornography.

It seems to me we can regulate where and how pornographic materials are sold. In the long run, as Justice John Paul Stevens suggested in a recent Supreme Court opinion, we must rely on "the capacity of the free marketplace of ideas to distinguish that which is useful or beautiful from that which is ugly or worthless."

**DENIS D. EGGLETON—RED CROSS
CERTIFICATE OF MERIT**

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, who knows what any of us would do if a friend were dying before our eyes? We would probably pray that we had the skills and the presence of mind to save that lingering life. But how much of any life-saving training could we recall at such a moment? Would we freeze, or instinctively shy away from such a confrontation with death?

Mr. Denis D. Eggleton of Waterbury, Conn., did not. On August 7, 1976, he was visiting his brother when his brother's 2-year-old daughter strayed from the adults. The adults searched the area rapidly and finally found the girl nearly drowned in an above-ground swimming pool she had fallen into. Seeing that her skin was very pale and her lips were blue, and being trained in Red Cross first aid, Mr. Eggleton began mouth-to-mouth resuscitation at once.

Though he was trained, the pressure of having only one chance, one try, at administering this life-saving technique must have been staggering. But he did keep his presence of mind, and he saved the young girl's life.

Within minutes she was stirring. When the ambulance arrived, she was fully conscious. Without a doubt, she would have died of drowning had not Mr. Eggleton acted so promptly and effectively.

For his actions, he was awarded the highest honor given by the Red Cross, the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This certificate bears the original signatures of the President of the United States; honorary chairman, and of Frank Stanton; chairman of the American National Red Cross.

A nation is, of course, its people. No one could have saved that girl except an individual, one person on the scene with the proper training. So, I am sure that more than just Connecticut is proud of this genuinely exemplary and heroic action by Mr. Eggleton.

**AQUACULTURE—A NEW NATIONAL
PRIORITY!**

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as most of my colleagues know, I am a strong advocate for, and believer in, the future of aquaculture in this country. For more than 2 years, my Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment and JOHN BREAUX's Subcommittee on Oceanography have been engaged in an active effort to bring legislation on aquaculture to fruition. Our subcommittees have held extensive hearings, commissioned a study by the Library of Congress, toured aquaculture facilities in the United States and abroad, participated in aquaculture seminars, and picked the brains of many experts in the field in order to determine what the needs are and how best to fill them.

During our hearings, we discovered that the world's fishery resources, once thought to be unlimited, are now estimated at a maximum level of global harvest of 100 to 150 million metric tons per year; more conservative estimates rarely exceed 100 million metric tons. In 1974, the world fishing catch was nearly 70 million metric tons. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has projected that the oceans can sustain an annual catch of only 100 million metric tons, a catch figure they expect to be reached by 1980, only 3 short years away.

Approximately one-fifth of the world's fishery resources are located within 200 miles of the U.S. coasts. Already, increased fishing has caused acute pressure on some stocks, depleting the supply and threatening their existence. About 20 species of fish and shellfish, including abalone and Pacific salmon, are believed to be seriously depleted.

An article in the June 1 Washington Post indicates that Japan has adopted a 7-year program that calls for spending more than \$600 million to foster the expansion of fish farming. Japan's goal for the year 2000 is to catch all the fish needed to fulfill one-half of the protein requirements of its population within 200 miles off its coasts. The Japanese fishery officials expect to achieve this goal by turning their coastal areas into "sea farms," that is, aquaculture.

The Library of Congress aquaculture study indicated that in 1965 Japan obtained over 6 percent of its total fish and shellfish production from aquaculture, while the United States obtained less than one-half of 1 percent. By 1974, Japan had increased aquaculture's share of its fish and shellfish production to 10 percent, while the United States had increased its share to only 3 percent. Further, the Japanese cultured more oysters by weight in 1974 than our combined culturing of clams, oysters, salmon, shrimp, and trout.

The Post article notes that—

... In the last ten years, conservation and the world's most advanced hatchery techniques have trebled Japan's salmon production and it may double in the next ten.

The implications of this fact should more than pique the interests of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest who are seeking a solution to our own Pacific salmon resource problems.

Mr. Speaker, although this article pertains to Japan, it does present a brief for the mind-boggling potential of aquaculture. I urge my colleagues to peruse this article and to support my legislation, H.R. 1833, the passage of which will allow this country to achieve its aquaculture potential.

The article, as it appeared in the Washington Post of June 1, 1977, follows: JAPAN LOOKS TO THE FUTURE OF FISH FARMS

(By John Saar)

CHITOSE, JAPAN.—Even the salmon-master of the Chitose River found it an awesome sight. Seven million tiny salmon—whirling, inch-long chips of black and silver—churned the waters under hatchery director Eiichi Sakano's fascinated gaze.

The thaw is coming, and soon the salmon will leave the friendly waters where they were raised from eggs under Sakano's care, to tumble 50 miles downriver to the sea. Three in a hundred will survive and grow in the North Pacific until, in four years time, the mysterious spawning instinct brings them fighting back up the Chitose River, where the females will lay 3,000 eggs apiece to replenish the hatcheries.

"The salmon's life is a divine activity," said marine biologist Sakano with slow-spoken precision. "Without man's help it cannot survive."

Man and nature in partnership for once. Yet, Sakano's hatchery in the starkly beautiful Hokkaido snow-country is something else—the bottom line on Japan's highly publicized anguish over fishery problems. In the last 10 years, conservation and the world's most advanced hatchery techniques have trebled Japan's salmon production and it may double in the next 10. The spectacular success with salmon is part of a massive fish-farming program to stock the seas around the Japanese archipelago and systematically harvest protein.

Japan has resisted the introduction of 200-mile fishing zones, claiming it could lose almost half its 10.6 million ton annual catch. The Japanese are heavily dependent on fish—seafood supplies half the protein intake for the population of 112 million. Negotiations for fishing rights in the new zones, first with the United States and currently the Soviet Union, have caused an alarmed public to worry about future fish supplies.

Meanwhile, fishery agency officials who long ago anticipated the international struggle over fishing grounds were forging a \$600 million plan that should allow Japan to catch all the fish it needs within 200 miles of its own coast by the year 2000.

In Hokkaido, fish-farming specialist Toshio Uasa explained: "Now we know we shall be kicked out of other people's sea, we must cultivate fish in our own waters."

"The coastal areas will be a sea farm," he added.

Backed by a nationwide research and development program, the aim is to replenish exhausted fishing grounds, create new ones with underwater "apartment houses" for fish, and reduce industrial pollution of the seas.

Only a fraction of the available coastal waters are now used for what is termed aquaculture, but the catch from the man-

made fishing grounds has zoomed 500 per cent in the last seven years. Hokkaido fishermen took up 13,000 tons of clams in 1971. After four-years of scientifically guided artificial cultivation, production is up to 45,000 tons a year.

Other delicacies now being cropped on a large scale are oysters, crabs, shrimp, edible seaweed and various free-swimming fish. The favored method and the one expanding fastest is the raising of fry from fish eyes for release in coastal waters. The high-priced fish favored in the nation's 40,000 sushiyas or raw fish restaurants, are pampered and fattened in floating enclosures. The process is very wasteful. It takes eight tons of sardines to produce a single ton of the specially tasty yellowfish and the search is on for a cheaper feed.

Even tuna, the fish prized above all others by sashimi-eaters for its buttersoft flesh, is now being grown at a third of its retail cost.

Research specialist Ichiro Asano says the rapid onset of 200-mile proclamations by the United States and other countries has accelerated the Japanese program for increased domestic production. "Our catchphrase now," he said, "is that we have to change from catching fish to making them."

After experimenting with sunken ships and old cars, the Japanese are now creating new fish beds with concrete cylinders pierced with windows. Dropped in groups of 4,000 in 150 feet of water, they rapidly attract shoals of fish. The cost is not low—new 21-ton concrete triangle units cost \$130,000 each—but government officials believe they will last forever.

Oddly enough, large-scale artificial production of fish is not the latest Japanese mass production process, but the first. Eiichi Sakano's salmon hatchery is 90 years old and a painting in his office shows his predecessors of Emperor Meiji's time raising salmon at the same site. "I'm proud of the past," he said, but he went on to emphasize the rapid improvements made possible by modern research.

When the spawning salmon were netted in Hokkaido's 80 major rivers last fall, about 10 per cent of their eggs were fertilized and sent to the hatcheries. The deliberately damp, gloomy building at Sakano's Chitose hatchery simulates the conditions of nature. A mountain stream running over pebble beds eventually carried the tiny fish out into the daylight over a four-month period.

Once an hour a woman worker sprays a fine powder of fishmeal and vitamins into the tanks and the fish turn the surface of the concrete tanks silver as they feed in tens of thousands. Protected from shock and predators, the fish graduate to the river in far greater numbers than if nature were allowed to take its course.

Of the 15 million salmon Sakano is releasing this year, he expects 150,000—half of them females—to return. A shy man of 52 in a tweed jacket and grey slacks, Sakano said: "When they go its like seeing our sons off for the first day at a new job. The most satisfying thing is when they come back because we know they are our children."

Some of the Japanese salmon are traveling farther than they can ever know. The Chitose hatchery workers were readying the last of a 2 million egg shipment for Chile. Japan has also agreed to share its technology with the Soviet Union in a new hatchery at Sakhalin on Russia's Pacific coast.

If the plan to bring Japan's 470,000 fishermen home by 2000 works, it will complete a 50-year cycle of industrial evolution. After World War II, when the Japanese people were desperately poor and hungry, indiscriminate overfishing exhausted the coastal waters. The trawler fleets then moved to the rich fishing grounds of other nations and eventually the reckless pillage by Japanese and others led to a cry for resource protection and the 200-mile zones.

Active conservation of coastal waters began about 10 years ago and the results are startlingly good. Catches are increasing and after long years of decline, the fishing villages are showing a new prosperity. Industrial pollution of the sea, which reached a peak with the Minamata mercury poisoning of several hundred people, is now receding. Fish are returning to the Inland Sea and fishery agency officials estimate that in 10 years the notorious Sea of Japan coast will be returned to the relatively low pollution levels of 1960.

Aquaculture provides 8 per cent of Japan's total fish catch and that share is expected to show a sharp increase. Each of the 40 coastal prefectures has a fishery research center either planned or under construction. The Japanese intend to map the thermal currents, the condition of the seabed and then stock the waters with the right fish—all to extend the concepts of livestock farming on land 200 miles out to sea.

BRICK TOWN ENERGY POLICY STATEMENT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement prepared by the Brick Town Chamber of Commerce in New Jersey. The chamber of commerce has prepared an energy policy statement outlining initiatives that could be taken to alleviate the energy problems faced by New Jersey and the United States.

I am very proud of Brick Township's Chamber of Commerce for not only grasping some of the complexities of the energy crisis, but also for taking the initiative of providing Government officials and the public with a constructive energy proposal. I would like at this time to request that the Brick Township Chamber of Commerce's energy policy statement be included in the RECORD of today's proceedings:

ENERGY POLICY STATEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The Brick Township Chamber of Commerce is mindful of the present energy production shortage in the United States and two recent energy messages of the President of the United States. It is further recognized that the production and consumption of various forms of energy have a great impact upon each county and state of the United States. The Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce, individually and as a collective body, propose the following energy policy statement for the consideration of the local, state and federal government.

The residents and business people of Brick Township and Ocean County are substantially dependent on a high degree of mobility for jobs, business, recreation and entertainment due to the proximity of New York City and surrounding metropolitan areas and Philadelphia. A high percentage of the residential population depend on motor vehicle transportation to commute to their jobs in distant towns and cities. The business community is increasingly dependent on motor vehicle transportation to bring their products or services to the public and other businesses. Tourism, the second largest industry in New Jersey and extremely important to Ocean County, also is dependent on the mo-

bility provided by motor vehicle transportation. And, last but not least, recreation and entertainment are dependent upon a high degree of mobility. This is particularly true of the boating industry, recreational craft industry and fishing industry which are also a very substantial basis for the local economy. These industries are dependent on the mobility provided by the consumption of oil and gas in motor vehicles, boats and airplanes.

ECONOMIC STABILITY

Therefore, this highly mobilized society must be maintained at a minimum cost to other competitive needs or forces such as energy conservation, ecology protection and social and economic development of our community and the entire country.

The local, state and federal government policies should be aimed at maintaining and encouraging this mobility by motor vehicles and other forms of transportation in order to prevent the local and state economy to become further depressed from its present poor condition. The President's proposed policies could restrict the mobility to such an extent as to further depress the local economy and inhibit economic growth. Mass transportation methods should be further developed and increased to reduce energy consumption for more efficient transportation of the population. In New Jersey, a north-south route should be further developed for railroad, bus or other forms of mass transportation to serve the commuters working in the metropolitan area as well as developing a county mass transportation system to accommodate local residents.

ENERGY PRODUCTION

Essential to the mobility and standard of living that we are accustomed to is the production of energy sources. Government policies should encourage the exploration and production of usable energy sources in the most efficient manner possible. This is particularly true with respect to oil and natural gas deposits and reserves within the land and its offshore limits. President Carter's message does not emphasize production enough and overemphasizes the reduction of energy consumption, although it is recognized that wasteful consumption must be greatly reduced. The production of oil and natural gas offshore along New Jersey is acceptable and encouraged if adequate safeguards can be insured to protect against oil spills which will damage our beaches and destroy the fish and other sea life. The on-land support facilities for drilling should be kept at a minimum with the larger facilities maintained as far inland as possible, utilizing existing oil refinery facilities as much as possible.

The nuclear generating capacity for electrical production should be increased as much and evenly throughout the country as possible. The Chamber of Commerce opposes any clusters of nuclear generating facilities in Ocean County due to the posed danger to the ecology and air pollution. An offshore nuclear generating facility is favored for medium range energy needs of the state and local areas as long as adequate ecological safeguards are insured. Research and development for nuclear generation by the fusion process should be supported for a long-range answer to our energy needs.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Research and development of other energy sources such as solar and thermal energy should proceed as fast as possible for economical use in the near future. The country's advance technology should also be employed to maximize the efficiency of consumer and capital goods that consume a generated source of energy.

CONSERVATION AND ECOLOGICAL PRESERVATION

And finally, our resources must be conserved and the delicate ecology preserved for Ocean County. This requires a delicate balancing of competing needs for the maxi-

mum use of our limited land resources and the economic and social growth of the county.

A responsible energy policy also requires responsible administration and regulation of the highest order. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and the New Jersey Board of Public Utility Commissioners, not to mention the appropriate Federal Administrative bodies, must be responsible and responsive to the total energy needs, ecology and conservation of limited resources consistent with our economic, social and political needs and philosophies.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

In addition, local and state governments must encourage the construction of homes and buildings that are more efficient in energy consumption for the lowest possible cost. They should aggressively support experimentation and development of energy conserving new modes of construction.

The Chamber of Commerce further recommends that state and local government policies be developed to encourage the maximum use of local labor to effectuate a voluntary redistribution of the labor force to local job opportunities and therefore, reducing energy waste from commuting to other work centers. In addition, local, state and federal policies should encourage the recycling of products and elimination of wasteful packaging in order to reduce energy consumption in the production and disposal processes.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILLIP L. LUCAS.

SANTA BARBARA COUNCIL FOR THE RETARDED—SILVER ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as was so well stated in the United Nations in 1956 "all of the human family without distinction of any kind, have equal and inalienable rights of dignity and freedom," so the developmentally disabled population of our Nation must continue to enjoy these inalienable rights.

The Santa Barbara Council for the Retarded has labored mightily for the past 25 years for the rights as well as the obligations of the mentally retarded. From humble and struggling beginnings through thousands of volunteer hours, unselfishly given, and 25 years of patience, dedication and devotion the SBCR has been a major spokesman for the developmentally disabled and has compiled an enviable list of accomplishments for the betterment of the community.

Any silver anniversary is a special occasion but for the SBCR, founded during the summer of 1952 by three concerned parents of developmentally disabled individuals, at extreme personal sacrifice, this anniversary is both a culmination and a beginning; great strides have been made and much remains to be done.

Because of the unusual dedication of this council and its many volunteer members, because of their legislative efforts on both the State and Federal levels in seeing that the developmentally disabled are recognized everywhere as per-

sons having rights and obligations and enjoying basic civil liberties, I ask the Members of the House to join with me in extending congratulations to the Santa Barbara Council for the Retarded and best wishes for continued success.

CRISIS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the impending depletion of the social security trust fund has spawned numerous reform proposals. Invariably, however, these proposals deal only with the immediate problem of how to get more money into the system—should we raise the social security taxes or transfer funds from general revenues?

It is refreshing, therefore, to read an analysis of the crisis in social security by the noted economist Hans Sennholz which looks at the nature and history of the whole system, identifies the real problems it faces, and comes up with realistic proposals to deal with them. The approach of Professor Sennholz could lead to a permanent solution, as opposed to proposals designed to coverup the immediate problem with the hope that somehow the real problem will go away or at least go unnoticed until after the next election.

Following is Professor Sennholz's article, which appeared in the June 1977 issue of *Private Practice*:

CRISIS IN SOCIAL SECURITY

In most of its endeavors the welfare state accomplishes the very opposite of what it sets out to achieve. The Social Security system, with all its noble intentions, is probably the most spectacular failure of them all. Born during the Great Depression it was to be a full-employment measure that would retire older workers and afford more jobs for younger workers. But the unemployment problem is still with us, with all its urgency and severity, although Social Security is supporting more than 30 million Americans. Despite its efforts and countless other employment measures, some seven to ten million Americans are walking the streets in idleness and dejection.

Social Security was to endow every person with the right to a minimum income upon retirement; lest he should become dependent upon his family and others. But it undoubtedly has weakened the will to independence, and has subjected most retirees to the discretion and benevolence of politicians.

The Social Security system has generally abandoned the principle that benefits should be based on the amount of contribution. Each worker's old age claim is related to "need" as defined by government in accordance with its current conceptions of adequacy. In other words, politicians are the judges of need and adequacy. It is they who bestow the right to define benefits. This is clearly illustrated by the fact that, from time to time, government raises the benefits to workers in retirement who, of course, no longer contribute to the system.

Politicians determine the conditions of eligibility. They define the concepts of "covered employment," retirement age, limits of earned income, the tax rates on covered workers and employers, ceilings on

taxable wages, etc. They define the rights of a covered worker's dependents to additional benefits. In other words, there is not a single phase of our Social Security program that does not depend on the politician's notions of social justice and economic adequacy.

This dependence of the beneficiaries on the good will of legislators is the logical outcome of the provisions that separate individual benefits from tax contributions. If they were actually linked to each other in order to establish a "contractual right" to old-age income, the present benefits would be so pitifully low that the lack of actual security to the beneficiary would become apparent immediately.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE OR EARNED BENEFITS?

Simple calculation easily ascertains that almost every present beneficiary soon withdraws what he contributed since the initiation of the system. After he receives the equivalent of his own contribution, the "right" to old-age income obviously constitutes the right to support by the state and ultimately by his tax-paying fellowmen. The term "insurance," in this respect, means public assistance.

Let us assume that a married person who regularly paid his taxes since the initiation of the system retired after twenty years of coverage on January 1, 1957. Let us also assume that he contributed the maximum payable under the law. From 1937 through 1949, he contributed one percent on \$3,000 annual income, \$30 per year, or a total of \$390 in 13 years. In 1950, he paid 1½ percent on \$3,000, or \$45. From 1951 through 1953, his payment amounted to 1½ percent on \$3,600 annually, or \$162. In 1954, he was taxed two percent on \$3,600, or \$72. In 1955 and 1956, his taxes amounted to two percent on \$4,200, or a total of \$168. Altogether he paid no more than \$837 during the first 20 years of coverage. If we add an equal amount of "employer contribution," which actually came out of his pay, his total contribution to the system amounted to \$1,674.

In 1957, this payment entitled a retiring couple to receive \$162.80 in monthly benefits, which since then have been raised to \$397.50 per month. In other words, in 1957 they received in 10 months and eight days the equivalent of their total contributions. His life expectancy, however, amounted to approximately 13 years, hers to 18 years. If they are still alive today, twenty years later, they are collecting every four months and six days what they paid in since the beginning. Their total benefits have exceeded \$50,000 on total contributions of \$1,674, or 30 times more than they paid in.

For most old-timers this ratio of benefits to contributions is even greater since only a few contributed the maximum amount.

How can the Social Security Administration pay many times more in benefits than it actually receives in contributions? For many years, it merely extended the compulsory coverage to an ever-widening circle of taxpayers. As long as additional millions of workers were added to the rolls, who were taxed but remained ineligible for payments because they had not yet reached retirement age, the means for the beneficiaries' support were secured. But the system created ever more future liabilities in order to stay solvent for the moment. Moreover, both the tax rates and the taxable income of the working population were raised sharply, which barely yielded revenue needed for current outlays. At the present, payroll taxes again are falling short of the benefits. And, according to the Social Security Administration itself, the actuarial deficit, or unfunded liability, amounts to more than \$2.1 trillion, which forebodes much higher payroll taxes in the future.

A TRANSFER SYSTEM BUILDS ON VICTIMS

This ominous development should not surprise us. If it is true that the first generation

has received a multiple of benefits over its contributions, the following generations must bear the burden of debt and receive less than they pay in. Like so many other political programs, the Social Security system is promoting consumption and benefits for the present generation at the expense of future generations. On a massive scale it redistributes income and wealth from young taxpayers to old beneficiaries.

The Social Security system, as so many other redistribution programs, divides society into two distinct classes—the beneficiaries and the victims. Physicians, dentists, attorneys, corporate executives, and other professional people, together with independent businessmen, almost invariably belong to the class of victims. In spite of their accumulated contributions they lose their rights to monthly benefits if they continue to earn \$250 in monthly fees. Only when they reach an age of 72 are they entitled to their benefits. But it should be obvious that any physician who, at age 65, is on his feet and in possession of his faculties, is earning more than \$250 per month, and therefore is promptly denied his benefits. But how many are reaching the ripe old age of 72 when they finally begin to draw the promised benefits? Surely very few can expect to live long enough to collect what they paid in during a long professional career.

The Social Security program taxes the professional class in order to support lower-income retirees. But even among the latter it injures the active and diligent who prefer to continue to work after 65. The laborer, too, loses his right to monthly benefits if he should earn more than \$250. In other words, to many workers after 65 it is more profitable to work only a few days of the month, merely earning the permissible wage that does not deprive them of their benefits. Many others, especially the unskilled and untrained, do not work at all because the potential labor income is too small when compared with Social Security benefits. In both cases, the system supports and encourages the inactivity of less productive workers with funds that are taken from active professional people. These continue to be taxed, regardless of age, as long as they are rendering services and earning labor incomes. In 1977, self-employed people are paying 7.9 percent of the first \$16,500 of earnings, or \$1,303.

The Social Security system must be censured because it violates standards of equity and justice. It redistributes earned income from one social class to another, and thereby breeds hostility and conflict. It encourages idleness rather than fruitful activity, political dependence rather than self-reliance, spending rather than thrift. And, above all, it has incurred a \$2 trillion deficit that it has placed on the backs of future generations.

In the coming years the Social Security system will undergo many changes and alterations. No system can forever live beyond its means and shift an ever-growing burden of debt to future generations. Sooner or later the victim generations may resent the shifting and endeavor to lighten the load through realistic reductions in benefits or outright repudiation of inherited tax liabilities via inflation or other default devices.

There can be no genuine reform of the Social Security system until we, first of all, become aware of the truth of the massive redistribution. To this end we are proposing the following reforms:

1. To restore realism, every recipient of Social Security benefits should be informed of the nature and source of his benefits. Every check should carry a stub that reveals the dollar amount contributed to the system and the amount of benefits received as of that day.

2. When the total benefits exceed the contributions by one thousand percent, the recipient should undergo a means test. A retired worker with sufficient income and

means of support should forfeit his benefits; lacking such means, his future payments should be truthfully called "public assistance."

3. At this point of tenfold benefits over contribution, the children of a retired worker should be called upon to contribute to the support of their parents. As the parents are responsible for their children, so are children responsible for their parents. No Social Security system should eradicate this moral law and commandment.

4. The system should not violate the religious and moral principles of conscientious objectors. Even in such a vital matter as national defense, American society has always respected the principles of those who refuse to bear arms or participate in military service. The same respect should be accorded to all religious and moral objectors to Social Security.

5. To grant relief to the primary victims of the system and abate the frantic shifting of burdens to future generations, we should seek to protect our youth. No worker should be forced to contribute more than twice the amount he would pay to a private insurer for identical coverage and benefits.

6. To grant relief to those victims who choose to work after 65 and thereby forfeit their right to benefits, their obligation to contribute should cease at the same time.

The financial dilemma of the Social Security system is giving rise to numerous reform proposals. Many turn out to be new concoctions of the same old redistribution medicine, prescribing new victims for old beneficiaries. We are proposing to begin with truth and information, the seeds for a true reform, without making an open assault to uproot that which is already existing. Reformation is a work of time. A national institution, however wrong and harmful it may be, cannot be totally changed at once. We must rebuild and regenerate its moral foundation so as to slowly bring people to adopt what would offend them if it were introduced by legislation and force.

MEDICAID PROGRAM

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a proposal developed by the administration to alter the requirements of the medicaid program for review of care delivered in various long-term care institutions. This set of recommendations for change in the medicaid statute is the legislation that was promised by Secretary Califano of HEW when he recently announced \$142 million of reductions in medicaid payments to some 20 States, because of their failure to meet the requirements of the current law.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expects to report to the House shortly as part of H.R. 3 their recommended proposal for delaying the imposition of the announced reductions and allowing States an additional 6 months to meet the requirements of the current law. Under the recommended amendment, if a State is in compliance at the end of the year for 1977, the Secretary would waive previously assessed reductions under section 1903(g) of the Social Security Act. Adoption of this proposal will provide the Congress sufficient time to consider carefully the

changes in the law recommended by the administration.

In introducing the administration proposal, I would be remiss if I did not note my concern about a number of their recommendations. I am reluctant to remove requirements that physicians periodically reassess the condition and need for care for medicaid patients in long-term care institutions, particularly in the light of another facet of their proposal which allows medical and independent professional review to be performed on only a sample of patients. I am concerned about the elimination of utilization review in intermediate care facilities, particularly since the administration has also recommended as part of H.R. 3 that PSRO review of care in ICF's would not occur unless the State is not performing the review in ICF's that is required by the law adequately. While I commend the approach which relates reductions in medicaid payments to the proportion of institutions where review has not been adequately performed, I am not satisfied that an approach which withholds certification to participate in medicaid from the institution involved is a fair one.

I believe these and other concerns will have to be explored carefully before we move ahead on the proposals. We will be seeking the views of interested parties—including groups representing the aged and disabled, State medicaid agencies, physicians, and others concerned with long-term care—as we proceed.

I am attaching a summary of the legislation for the information of the Members:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

The first section of the bill would provide the short title of the Act—"The Utilization Control Amendments of 1977".

Section 2 of the bill would repeal provisions of title XIX of the Social Security Act which currently require the State agency responsible for administering the Medicaid plan to establish a program of medical review of the care provided by skilled nursing facilities and mental hospitals and a program of independent professional review of the care provided by intermediate care facilities. The bill would make the administration of these programs a function of the licensing agency in each State, which under current law, is already responsible for surveying State health institutions and for certifying that they meet the requirements for participation in the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Under the bill, each health care facility participating in Medicaid, as a condition of its annual certification for such participation, would have to meet the standards established by the State's licensing agency for medical review (MR) or independent professional review (IPR). This amendment, by making MR and IPR a part of the certification process, would make the quality of medical care a standard by which institutions would be determined eligible for participation in Medicaid. Furthermore, it would provide a clear sanction—decertification—whenever the State standards are not met. Finally, by placing responsibility for several aspects of the survey, medical review and evaluation, and certification processes in one agency, some of the duplication of effort which currently results from a division of responsibility between two agencies would be eliminated. The amendment also refers specifically to the role of nurses in medical review of skilled nursing facilities.

Section 3 of the bill would modify the fiscal sanctions currently required to be imposed when a State does not have adequate

programs of utilization review (UR), medical review, and independent professional review. Section 1903(g) of the Social Security Act now requires a one-third reduction of federal Medicaid payments with respect to long-stay cases (institutionalization in a hospital, skilled nursing facility, or intermediate care facility in excess of sixty days or institution-ization in a mental hospital in excess of ninety days) in the case of any State which lacks an effective program of control over utilization of institutional health care services (UR, MR, and IPR). This reduction is required for all such payments for long-stay cases in any fiscal year in which the State fails to make a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that is in compliance with the provisions of the statute that require a program of control over utilization of health care services. This rather substantial penalty is unrelated to the extent of the failure once it is determined that a State is out of compliance, the State has no opportunity to correct any program deficiencies in order to avoid the imposition of payment reductions.

Section 3 of the bill would relate the amount of any fiscal reduction required on account of a State's failure to have an adequate program of control over utilization of health care services to the degree of non-compliance. Specifically, no federal financial participation would be available to cover the cost of services provided by a health facility for which the State did not provide an adequate program. The reduction would be applied on a quarterly basis, beginning with the quarter following notification to the State of noncompliance. Finally, the Secretary would have the discretion to postpone the penalty for up to six months to give a State the opportunity to correct its failure. The "penalty provision" currently in the law would be repealed retroactively to July 1, 1973, and the new provision would be effective beginning January 1, 1978. However, in the case of any State which the Secretary determined was not complying with the review requirements in the law during the second quarter of fiscal year 1977, any payment reduction required under the current law through that quarter would be made by the Secretary if he determines that the State did not correct its deficiencies by the end of this calendar year.

Section 4 of the bill would modify the utilization review requirements in current law. In addition to medical review and independent professional review, which are annual activities conducted by each State, the law requires a continuous program of screening of every medical facility admission, and the medical evaluation of a sample of those admissions. Standards are specified in the law pertaining to the personnel who may conduct such screenings and evaluations. Section 4 would clarify the language currently in section 1903(g) of the statute, make a few minor changes in the requirements, and make the standards a part of the State plan requirements. Finally, it would require utilization review as a condition of full federal reimbursement under Medicaid only in hospitals. The bill would retain, as State plan requirements, utilization review in skilled nursing facilities and physician certification of each patient admission to a health facility. The bill does not amend title XI of the Social Security Act, pertaining to Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSRO's). As a result of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations and clarifying amendments in H.R. 3 (section 5(a)), once a PSRO assumes utilization review responsibilities the title XIX review requirements shall not apply.

Section 5 of the bill would authorize States to conduct medical review and independent professional review on a sample basis. Sampling is already permissible (and would be retained under the bill) for utilization review. The bill would include a similar provi-

sion for MR and IPR, and, like UR, would be subject to regulation by the Secretary (to assure proper procedures and adequate sample size.)

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to strengthen and improve procedures for reviewing and controlling the utilization of medical services under Medicaid, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "The Utilization Control Amendments of 1977."

FINDINGS OF MEDICAL REVIEW AND INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL REVIEW AS STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1902(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out paragraphs (26) and (31); by redesignating paragraphs (27) through (30) as paragraphs (26) through (29), respectively; by redesignating paragraphs (32) through (36) as paragraphs (30) through (34), respectively; by striking out "and" after paragraph (33), as redesignated by this subsection; by striking out the period after paragraph (34), as redesignated by this subsection, and inserting instead ", and"; and by adding after paragraph (34), as redesignated, the following new paragraph:

"(35) provide that the State or local agency utilized by the Secretary for the purpose specified in the first sentence of section 1864(a), or if such agency is not the State agency which is responsible for licensing health institutions, the State agency responsible for such licensing, will perform for the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the plan approved under this title the function of determining whether institutions and agencies meet the requirements for participation in the program under such plan; which determination shall, among other things, be based on the findings resulting from (A) the licensing agency's program of medical review (including medical evaluation of each patient's need for skilled nursing facility care or, in the case of individuals who are eligible therefore under the State plan, need for care in a mental hospital), which program shall include (i) review of the written plans of care for each patient, and where applicable, plans of rehabilitation prior to admission to a skilled nursing facility; (ii) periodic inspections of all skilled nursing facilities and mental institutions (if the State plan includes care in such institutions) within the State by one or more medical review teams (composed of physicians, nurses, and other appropriate health and social service personnel) of (I) the care being provided in such nursing facilities (and mental institutions, if care therein is provided under the State plan) to persons receiving assistance under the State plan, (II) with respect to each of the patients receiving such care, the adequacy of the services available in particular nursing facilities (or institutions) to meet the current health needs and promote the maximum physical well-being of patients receiving care in such facilities (or institutions), (III) the necessity and desirability of the continued placement of such patients in such nursing facilities (or institutions), and (IV) the feasibility of meeting their health care needs through alternative institutional or noninstitutional services; and (iii) the making by such team or teams of full and complete reports of the findings resulting from such inspections together with any recommendations to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan and to the licensing agency and (B) the licensing agency's program of independent professional review (including medical evaluation of each patient's need for intermediate

care), which program shall include (i) review of written plans of service prior to each admission or authorization of benefits in an intermediate care facility as determined under regulations of the Secretary; (ii) periodic on-site inspections to be made in all such intermediate care facilities (if the State plan includes care in such institutions) within the State by one or more independent professional review teams (composed of physicians or registered nurses and other appropriate health and social service personnel) of (I) the care being provided in such intermediate care facilities to persons receiving assistance under the State plan, (II) with respect to each of the patients receiving such care, the adequacy of the services available in particular intermediate care facilities to meet the current health needs and promote the maximum physical well-being of patients receiving care in such facilities, (III) the necessity and desirability of the continued placement of such patients in such facilities, and (IV) the feasibility of meeting their health care needs through alternative institutional or non-institutional services; and (iii) the making by such team or teams of full and complete reports of the findings resulting from such inspections, together with any recommendations to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan and to the licensing agency."

(b) Section 1902(a)(31) of such Act, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, is amended to read as follows:

"(31) provide that the State health agency, or other appropriate State medical agency, shall be responsible for establishing a plan, consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, for the review by appropriate professional health personnel of the appropriateness and quality of care and services furnished to recipients of medical assistance under the plan in order to provide guidance with respect thereto in the administration of the plan to the State agency established or designated pursuant to paragraph (5) and, where applicable, to the State agency described in the second sentence of this subsection; and"

(c) The penultimate sentence of section 1902(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "(29), (31), and (33)," and inserting instead "(28), (31), and (35)."

(d) Section 1903(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "1902(a)(34)" and inserting instead "1902(a)(32)".

(e) Section 1908 of such Act is amended by striking out "1902(a)(29)" each place it appears and inserting instead "1902(a)(28)".

(f) Section 1910(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "1902(a)(28)" and inserting instead "1902(a)(27)", provided that the State licensing agency referred to in section 1902(a)(35) has determined that the institution meets the standards of the medical review program referred to in section 1902(a)(35)(A)".

(g) The amendments made by this section shall become effective January 1, 1978.

MODIFICATION OF PENALTY PROVISION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1903(g) of such Act is not effective with respect to fiscal quarters beginning after June 30, 1973, and before December 31, 1977. However, with respect to any State whose payment under section 1903(a) for any quarter beginning after June 30, 1973, and before March 31, 1977, would have been reduced on account of section 1903(g) but for the preceding sentence, such payment for any such quarter shall be so reduced notwithstanding the preceding sentence if, by January 1, 1978, such State has not made a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that it has corrected its failure to comply with section 1903(g) (as that section read prior to enactment of this Act) which would otherwise require a reduction in its

payment for the quarter ending March 31, 1977. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall determine that a State has corrected any such failure if, with respect to each institution for which such State failed to perform the medical review or independent professional review required to be performed during the quarter ending March 31, 1977, pursuant to the law in effect during such quarter, the State makes a showing, satisfactory to the Secretary, that such review for each such institution was performed prior to January 1, 1978.

(b) Effective January 1, 1978, section 1903 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Secretary shall periodically validate State compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (29) (A) and (35) of section 1902(a). Validation procedures may include sample onsite surveys of public and private institutions in which recipients of medical assistance may receive care and services pursuant to a State plan approved under this title. Whenever the Secretary determines, pursuant to such validation procedures, that, with respect to one or more institutions in the State, the State did not adequately perform its responsibilities under paragraphs (29) (A) or (35) of section 1902(a), the Secretary shall notify the State that the amount payable to such State under subsection (a) of this section for each succeeding fiscal quarter shall be reduced by the amount which would otherwise be payable on account of medical assistance provided by such institution or institutions under the State plan during each such quarter, until the State shows, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that it is meeting its responsibilities under such paragraphs with respect to such institutions. Until the Secretary is so satisfied, he shall make any reduction referred to in the preceding sentence, except that, if the State has developed a plan, satisfactory to the Secretary, for complying with paragraphs (29) (A) and (35), the Secretary may postpone the effective date of any reduction required, for a period of time not exceeding six months, to allow the State, pursuant to the plan, to fully comply with the requirements of such paragraphs."

MODIFICATION OF UTILIZATION REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1902(a) (29) of such Act, as redesignated by section 2 of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

"(29) (A) provide such methods and procedures relating to the utilization of care and services provided by hospitals under the plan (which methods and procedures meet the requirements imposed by section 1861 (k) for purposes of title XVIII) so as to safeguard against unnecessary utilization of such care and services, including utilization review whereby (I) in each case in which services are provided under the State plan, such services are furnished under a plan established and periodically reviewed and evaluated by a physician, and (II) each hospital admission and continued stay is screened by appropriately trained personnel who do not have a significant financial interest in the hospital providing the care involved and are not themselves directly responsible for the care of the patient involved, in accordance with criteria established by medical personnel and, where appropriate, other professional personnel, who do not have a significant financial interest in the hospital providing the care involved; and the information developed for such screening, along with the data obtained from prior reviews of the necessity for admission and continued stay of patients, is used as the basis for establishing the size and composition of the sample of admissions and continued stays to be subject to review and evaluation by medical personnel, and where appropriate, other professional personnel, who do not have a significant financial in-

terest in the hospital providing the care involved and are not themselves directly responsible for the care of the patient involved, and the Secretary may, by regulation, require any such sample to be of any size up to 100 per centum of all admissions or continued stays, but such sample must be of sufficient size to serve the purpose of (i) identifying the patterns of care being provided and the changes occurring over time in such patterns so that the need for modification may be ascertained, and (ii) subjecting admissions to early or more extensive review where information indicates that such consideration is warranted;

"(B) provide for such methods and procedures relating to the utilization of care and services provided by skilled nursing facilities under the plan which methods and procedures meet the requirements imposed by section 1861(k) for purposes of title XVIII;

"(C) provide that in each case for which payment is made under the State plan, a physician certifies at the time of admission, or if later, the time the individual applies for medical assistance under the State plan, that services under the plan are or were required to be given on an inpatient basis because the individual needs or needed such services; and

"(D) provide such methods and procedures relating to the payment for care and services available under the plan to assure that payments (including payment for any drugs provided under the plan) are not in excess of reasonable charges consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care;"

(b) Section 1903(l) of such Act is amended by striking out "and" after paragraph (3) and inserting instead a period and by striking out paragraph (4).

(c) The penultimate sentence of section 1902(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "and of section 1903(l) (4)," by inserting "(29)," after "(28)."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective January 1, 1978.

AUTHORITY TO USE SAMPLING PROCEDURES FOR MEDICAL AND INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL REVIEW

SEC. 5. (a) Section 1902(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding the requirement in paragraph (35) that medical review and evaluation or independent professional review and medical evaluation be performed with respect to each patient, a State may fulfill that requirement by conducting such reviews and evaluation on a sample of patients, provided that the sample is of sufficient size to serve the purpose of identifying the patterns of care being provided and the changes occurring over time in such patterns so that the need for modification may be ascertained, and the Secretary may, by regulation, require any such sample, consistent with the preceding proviso, to be of any size up to 100 per centum of the patients. The preceding sentence shall not apply to the requirement in paragraph (35) that each patient have a written plan of care."

(b) This section shall become effective January 1, 1978.

officially recognized the birthplace of radio broadcasting.

I am extremely proud to say it took place in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the world's first scheduled broadcast was made by KDKA radio on November 2, 1920, from a tiny, makeshift shack atop building K of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. in Turtle Creek, Pa. That historic first consisted of flashing to the world the news that Warren Harding had become the 29th President of the United States by defeating James Cox in the election.

A plaque commemorating this event was dedicated June 17, 1977, climaxing Turtle Creek's official observance of the Nation's Bicentennial. However, the Harding-Cox broadcast was just the first of many firsts for KDKA since much of its early history actually is the early history of radio. The firsts KDKA recorded also were firsts for the industry as well.

For example, KDKA aired the first Presidential inauguration speech—President Harding's—the first regular church broadcast, the first blow-by-blow description of a boxing match—Johnny Ray versus Johnny Dundee, no decision—and the first play-by-play report of a baseball game—Pittsburgh defeating Philadelphia.

On hand for the dedication ceremony were several of KDKA's early employees, including H. W. Arlin, acknowledged as the world's first full-time radio announcer; T. F. Harnack, a broadcaster, and Gene Morie, one of the first singers of the airwaves.

Joining these "oldtimers," were present-day officials of KDKA and the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.: G. E. Wallis, regional vice president of Westinghouse; A. B. Hartman, general manager of KDKA radio, and William Steinbach, the station's top newsmen.

Also participating were representatives of Westinghouse Electric Corp.—N. A. Beldecos, vice president and general manager of LRA division; T. H. New, administrative assistant to Mr. Beldecos and president of Westinghouse Valley Chamber of Commerce—and Turtle Creek Borough officials, led by Mayor D. L. Harper and William Hoppell, chairman of the community's Bicentennial commission.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congress of the United States I extend our sincere appreciation to the pioneers of radio and to those individuals who wisely decided to record the history of the airwaves on the pages of history.

LOW TAXES BUILD PROSPERITY

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how do you end the everlasting problem of unemployment? Experience proves that low taxes build prosperity. Government was never intended to pro-

RADIO BROADCASTING—KDKA—
BORN IN TURTLE CREEK, PA.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania Historical Commission and the National Register of Historical Sites have

vide jobs for its people; bureaucrats function poorly in such a role.

What America needs is a reduction in taxes. Reduced taxes help new businesses develop and create incentives for already established businesses to increase employment. New Hampshire, for example, in the heart of the generally depressed Northeast, has neither an income tax nor a general sales tax. Per capita combined State and local taxes are the lowest in the United States. And taxes on business profits are at a rate lower than any Northeast State—a flat 7 percent, compared with 9½ percent in Massachusetts and 10 percent in Connecticut and New York. The result has been a surge in employment to a point where new jobs are created at a rate of more than 15,000 a year and where the State now has one of the best records in job growth while simultaneously holding unemployment to one of the lowest levels. This strong work ethic also discourages welfare, which finds New Hampshire with the least number per 1,000 of any State in New England.

A decrease of tax revenues, however, necessarily entails a decrease in expenditures. As veteran observer Donn Tibbetts, statehouse bureau chief for the Manchester Union Leader, sees it, "We in this State don't give every possible service we could provide. But I don't drive a Cadillac either. You always have to compromise somewhere." And compromise we must. Lower taxes create more jobs. But lower taxes without a simultaneous decrease in expenditures is fictitious.

New Hampshire's success in decreasing its unemployment has resulted from a basic frugality that has characterized the State's entire government. New Hampshire has the lowest per capita public debt in New England. Its surging economy can be attributed not to a never-ending effort to make work for its people but to a healthy business atmosphere created by low taxes. In Texas, we believe in low taxes and incentives to help business grow and prosper. Low taxes and low government spending are the base of success whether one lives in Dallas, Tex., or Manchester, N.H.

FIRST-TIME OWNERS OF HOMES DECLINING

HON. ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. Speaker, that headline from the Sunday New York Times could very well serve as an advertisement for the Young Families Housing Act of 1977.

While our Nation may be in the midst of a housing boom, soaring prices are making it increasingly difficult for the young person or family just starting out to afford their first home.

As the article from the Times points out, the percentage of people buying houses for the first time is dropping sharply. As recently as 4 years ago, the

housing market was evenly divided among families who were buying their first homes and families who were using the equity in houses they already owned as a down payment. According to the latest statistics, this year only about 35 percent of houses are being purchased by first-time home buyers.

The trend promises to worsen. Without some relief, young families, regardless of the economic sacrifices they are willing to make, may soon find it impossible to purchase their first home. I am sure my colleagues would share my concern about this disturbing trend and seek to find a remedy.

The Young Families Housing Act offers a solution. This bill would permit a first-time home buyer to save for a down payment through a tax-free savings account. The bill would also provide for graduated monthly mortgage payments, which would more closely reflect a family's income growth over the duration of the mortgage.

I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the New York Times article which illustrates very well the need for legislative action:

FIRST-TIME OWNERS OF HOMES DECLINING—
RISING PRICES CAUSE DIFFICULTIES FOR MANY
YOUNG PEOPLE

(By Robert Lindsey)

LOS ANGELES, June 25—America is in the midst of its biggest single-family housing boom in history, but soaring prices are forcing adjustments for a generation of young people trying to realize the dream of home ownership.

And, despite the sacrifices many are willing to make, the percentage of people buying houses for the first time is dropping sharply.

Perhaps typical of some of those people to find the money to become buyers are James Minor, the United States Public Health Service pharmacist here, who is 29 years old, and his wife, Yvonne, 28. For months, they watched the price of homes climb seemingly into the stratosphere while their \$240 apartment rent left them with only a monthly receipt.

MEDIAN PRICE IS \$49,000

This spring, Mrs. Minor went to work at a local savings bank, the couple plunged deeper into debt than either of them had ever imagined, and they moved into a 14-year-old home in suburban San Pedro, for which they paid \$52,000.

"It was a tremendous price by the standards we were used to in North Carolina where we grew up," she recalled, "but we wanted our own home. It takes two salaries to keep a house going these days—it's a necessity for women to work if you want to own your own home."

Price increases have brought the national median cost of a new home to almost \$49,000 and caused a steadily widening gap between home prices and average income. A recent Federal survey concluded that the median value of a single-family home had risen 73 percent between 1970 and late 1975, while the median income rose 40 percent. Some experts believe that the gap has widened even more since 1975.

Proportionately, there are now fewer first-time buyers than there used to be. As recently as four years ago, according to Government data, the housing market was evenly divided among families who were buying their first homes, and families who were using the equity in houses they already owned as down payments. This year, according to a survey by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, only about 35 percent of houses

are being purchased by first-time home buyers, with the balance being purchased by owners who can parlay inflated equities in previous homes into new ones.

Most housing experts expect at least 1.5 million new homes to be started in 1977, about 20 percent more than in 1972, the previous record year.

HOW ARE THEY DOING IT?

So, while the price trend has forced many young families out of the housing market, many others are buying homes at prices that only a few years ago seemed in the luxury class. How are they doing it? Interviews with developers, real estate agents and scores of young families in 14 cities during the last two weeks have indicated some fundamental changes in the living and home-buying patterns of the 20-to-35 generation:

More wives are working to buy a home. Few young couples can afford a home on one salary; the need for the wife's paycheck is contributing to the reduced birth rate and causing more mothers to take jobs outside the home.

Many younger couples are going more deeply into debt than their parents did to support the mortgage payments, taxes and other housing expenses. While monthly payments equal to 20 to 25 percent of income were typical in the past, the average now is more likely to be 25 to 30 percent, and monthly payments that take even a greater proportion of income are not uncommon.

These proportionately higher payments are leaving more and more first-time buyers in financial squeezes that could get them into trouble if one of the two paychecks is lost. Some couples are being forced to cut down on expenses for food, vacations and other items.

Many younger couples can find homes they can afford only far from city jobs, lower their expectations for their first house; instead of a bright new home in a sparkling suburb, more and more are buying older "handyman special" homes in the suburbs and, increasingly, more are moving into older homes in cities.

Many younger couples can only find homes they can afford far from city jobs, which means long, energy-consuming trips to work.

In California and other communities where housing costs are higher than even the national average, prices are increasingly prompting some younger people to move away to low-cost rural communities or to other states where housing prices are still relatively low, such as Arizona or parts of the Middle West or South.

TYPICAL OF TRENDS

A recent study by the Irvine Company, one of California's largest developers, whose offer of property in Orange County south of here led to bidding wars that raised the median price to more than \$100,000, perhaps indicates the national trend:

In 1973, wives worked in 31 percent of the families that bought a home at Irvine; this year, the ratio is 50 percent. In 1973, 39 percent of buyers were purchasing their first home, the balance using equities from previously owned homes; now the percentage of first-time buyers is down to 31 percent. And the average age of buyers is increasing to 38.5 years from 35 years in 1974.

In years past, many lending institutions refused to recognize a wife's income in computing eligibility for a mortgage, largely because of an expectation that she would become pregnant. Now, partly because of birth control technology and partly because of the fear of legal action, more and more lenders are giving full weight to a woman's salary sometimes even if the man and woman acquiring a home are unmarried.

Typical of today's first-time home buyers are Robert McDonald, 25, and his wife, Diane, 26. He works for a bank in New York City and she is a secretary for a Greenwich, Conn., company. After saving all of her salary for

several years to accumulate a down payment, they recently moved from their Yonkers apartment to a new house in Yorktown Heights.

"My mother comes from the old tradition where you get married and have kids right away," he said. "I tell her, 'Ma, there is no way you do that.'"

Another Westchester couple, Timothy and Chris Herlihy have two children, 6 and 3 years old, and, for now, have given up hope of buying a home on his salary at a Mount Kisco fuel company. "Today, with anybody I know," Mrs. Herlihy said, "you have to have somebody helping you—or you are both working."

ECONOMICS PLAYS PART

In Huntington, L.I., Carl S. Burr Sr., a real estate agent, said:

"It's a startling change, having both work. And I guess it's not just women's lib, but economics. Of the last 100 deals we handled, 20 were first-time buyers—all young couples with no children, and in only two or three cases were the wives at home."

Many realtors note the inflated aspirations of the buyers. "Many suffer from a champagne taste and a beer pocketbook," said William M. Tryder 3d, a realtor in suburban Boston. "What they must realize is that a \$20,000 home of five years ago would be in the low to mid-thirties today. Those who are buying at the lower price range are being faced with homes 20 years or older."

"Young people are having to locate further away from the major city," William Abraham, another Boston area realtor, said. "They don't want to buy there but they have to; you can save almost \$1,000 on a house for each mile you drive out from Route 128. But they lose some of it back paying for gasoline to work."

OLDER HOMES REHABILITATED

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board sees some benefit in the economic pressure to buy older homes. "To an increasing degree," the board said recently, "first-time home purchasers appear to be using existing homes more often for their first homes, and expenditures and remodeling have been accelerating; thus, there is an important improvement in the quality of the existing housing stock that is not measured in looking at housing starts."

For all the young families who are managing to buy their own home, there are many, particularly in one-salary blue-collar families, who are despairing. If present conditions continue, some housing experts believe, the large number of baby-boom generation Americans who have been priced out of the American dream could become a political force to be reckoned with.

"We used to think my husband made a good salary," said Nancy Weingartner, the wife of a 28-year-old aerospace engineer who lives near San Diego, "but now by the time we pay the rent and the gas bill and so forth, his full paycheck is almost gone. We're willing to make sacrifices for a house, but still that wouldn't be enough. By the time we could save \$6,000 for a house, we would need \$10,000 or \$15,000 more."

However, many young Americans are managing to get the money together. Thomas Prin, a New York City fireman, and his wife, Karen, who recently moved into the Levitt House development in Medford, L.I., face a long commute, some sacrifices on his \$17,000-a-year salary and some part-time work for her.

But, Mrs. Prin said, "We wanted to be able to say something was ours. It's nice here; quiet. No pollution. Our dream house? Maybe not. But it's something we can afford and it's great for a starter."

TRAPPED INTO HYPOCRISY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following column by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers. Mr. Hearst's commentary analyzes the lack of consistency in the Carter foreign policy in terms of U.S. relations with Cuba and Rhodesia:

TRAPPED INTO HYPOCRISY

(By William Randolph Hearst Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Even as the Carter administration steps up its efforts to embrace the Communist and atheist government of Cuba and moves ahead with friendlier dealings with the atheist and Marxist dictatorship in Vietnam, it may come as news to many Americans that our policy in Africa is taking the form of increased efforts to crush and silence the anti-Communist Christian white minority in Rhodesia.

The statement of UN Ambassador Andrew Young that he does not fear communism as much as he does "racism"—something he ascribes to widening numbers of white leaders, including Abraham Lincoln—has apparently pervaded the high councils of the Carter White House until it has come to dominate African policy.

Thus it transpired that in the ebb in the flow of news over the recent three-day Memorial Day weekend a small story out of the UN, with major and serious implications, virtually escaped the notice of much of the nation's major press—although as head of editorial operations for The Hearst Newspapers, I am proud to report that alert reportage and editorial comment caused these newspapers to be among the few publications to bring this startling story to the attention of the public and officialdom in Washington.

In brief, the United States government has joined with the UN Security Council in ordering the Rhodesian government to close its Information Office in Washington by June 30, thus silencing the voice of their white minority in our nation.

On Friday, May 27, the UN Security Council voted unanimously to adopt a resolution demanding the closure of the few remaining offices of the Ian Smith government abroad. The decision is aimed mainly at the Rhodesian Information Office in Washington since similar offices in Paris and Sydney have already been closed. Since the U.S. co-sponsored the resolution the measure obviously had the backing of the Carter administration—a fact that has since been verified by both the President and by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.

It is customary for the UN Security Council to meet at 3 p.m. Thus, when the vote was finally taken, it went out into the comparative void of the long Memorial Day weekend, and the item attracted but scant attention.

Not until the following week did some editors reread the little story and have some second thoughts about it. Was it not, they asked, in violation of our Constitution's First Amendment which guarantees access of information and the rights of a Free Press?

By the end of this past week many others, including some prominent congressional spokesmen in Mr. Carter's own party, wondered if it was not virtually the epitome of hypocrisy to prohibit Rhodesia from disseminating information in this country,

while we allow, for instance, the Palestinian Liberation Organization, which is not a government, to maintain an information office in New York.

After all, informational services of many other countries spew forth information about wide-ranging ideologies and philosophies, in this country, and we welcome the exchange of views. Why not Rhodesian?

The most important principle here, it would seem to me, is America's traditional support of the free flow of information. It is being undermined. Fidel Castro, with whom Mr. Carter wishes to negotiate, has stated bluntly that he will never allow a free press in Cuba. Yet information about Cuba which Castro wants disseminated in the U.S. is distributed through the Cuban mission to the United Nations. Rhodesia has no such mission.

Shutting down the Rhodesian Information Office in Washington—though it results almost mechanically as a consequence of the Anglo-American pact on Rhodesia—does violence to the American tradition of freedom of speech.

In this nation, "the land of the free," which Mr. Carter is holding up as the citadel of human rights, we are supposed to believe in an open exchange of opinions, of free and open debate. We are supposed to cherish the idea that all sides of discussion, even the most unpopular or unpleasant, deserves a fair hearing.

Is this to be the American policy for everyone but Rhodesians?

An encouraging voice vote was recorded by the U.S. Senate Thursday evening, taking sharp issue with President Carter over the administration's commitment to the UN to close down the Rhodesian Information Office. It should not be overlooked that the Senate is Democrat-controlled and that such a vote is a significant statement of policy. Moreover, Virginia Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., told The Hearst Newspapers that he is "very upset" with the administration's commitment to close the Rhodesian office and that he intends to speak on the subject in the Senate Monday.

Most members of the UN Security Council do not believe in the rights and guarantees about free speech, free press, and the free access to information. Thus they experience no twinges of guilt in voting sanctions and embargoes against Rhodesia, because its white settlers—who have been there nearly a century—are in a racial minority. It is not surprising to see these nations vote as they did. What is surprising, is how easily the United States accommodated itself to the majority.

The U.S. took an even more serious step against the Smith government in Rhodesia earlier this year when Congress repealed the Byrd Amendment which, in the past six years, had specifically authorized imports of chrome and some other metals in violation of the Security Council's economic embargo. Some other nations, notably Russia and Switzerland, which had also agreed to embargo Rhodesian strategic materials, were buying them anyway, mostly from South Africa.

It should be remembered that the Security Council first imposed selective sanctions against Rhodesia in December, 1966, one year after the white minority led by Ian Smith had proclaimed independence from Britain. Since then the Council has been gradually reinforcing the sanction system. At the time of the May 27 vote, all but the five Western delegations in the Security Council were urging total isolation of Rhodesia by cutting off rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communications. The Western nations stopped this total sanc-

tion, at least temporarily, by voting to cut off funds for the Rhodesian Information Offices.

But let's just stick with the fundamentals. The United States is, we like to think, the most enlightened nation on Earth. We insist on the free flow of information, on the free exchange of ideas, opinions and philosophies, and on freedom of the press, for strictly selfish reasons. How else can we remain fully informed?

So aside from what this crackdown means to Rhodesia, let's consider what it means to us. It is already extremely difficult to get unbiased information from Africa, for it is filtered through the "Third World" communications system of the UN. The Rhodesian Information Office offered us alternative thoughts, and some alternative and additional facts and figures.

The "right" that has been violated by the vote of the UN Security Council and by the Carter administration's incredible support of that vote, is not just the "right" of a foreign government to lobby in Washington.

Rather, it is the "right to know" of the American people, and to learn as much as they can about a highly-charged, highly-explosive, transcendently-important social and economic situation that will be occupying our attention for years to come.

Whether we like Rhodesia or not, it has as much right as any other nation to present its views to Americans. Thoughtful Americans have a constitutionally-guaranteed right to listen, if they so desire.

That is the issue, nothing less.

HELSINKI'S UNFULFILLED PROMISE

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1975 at Helsinki, the Soviet Government pledged to respect human rights and to assist in the reuniting of families across political borders. Each day in this Chamber, Members hear another case demonstrating that the Soviet Government has not lived up to that pledge.

Originally, I had planned to tell the story of Ludmilla Slutskaya. I was going to say that Ludmilla, a Soviet mechanical engineer, first applied to emigrate in November 1972. I was going to explain that she was denied permission for "security reasons," because she worked in a sporting goods plant which also happened to supply items to the military. I was going to say that she had lost her job because her supervisor learned of her desire to emigrate.

However, yesterday I found out that Ludmilla has received permission to emigrate. She and her 5-year-old daughter are right now making preparations to leave the Soviet Union and join her husband in Israel.

Ludmilla Slutskaya is proof that Soviet authorities respond to pressure from outside. It is crucial that we keep up that pressure.

We cannot remain silent until the promise of Helsinki is fulfilled.

SAVING FREE ENTERPRISE

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, preservation of the free enterprise system, which for over 200 years has given the citizens of this Nation the highest degree of personal freedom as well as the highest standard of living in the world, is a matter of great concern as we enter our third century.

As part of a continuing program to promote awareness of the free enterprise system and the merits as well as the means for its preservation among young people, the South Dakota Stock-growers Association conducts an annual essay contest. Among those awarded prizes in the 1977 competition was the following:

HOW THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM CAN BE SAVED

(Nancy J. Larson, Washington Senior High School)

Free enterprise is the heart and the driving force of America's unique form of government. Democracy and each of its guaranteed freedoms for the individual are inextricably tied to our system of a free market and profit, for without the stimulation of competition and the highest reward for the best man, there would be little reason for all the people themselves to play such a major part in the governing of our country. Yet if all this is true, if we claim democracy to be the best and only form of government for us, then why is the only economic system that can be the result of a true democracy being attacked and downgraded here in our own country? What conditions have led our country to the point where too many of its people are dissatisfied with the system that has only their best interests at its purpose?

The first place to look for problems is at business itself. Many people might disagree, saying, "But I never hear any complaining or dissatisfaction from the businessman!" And this is exactly my point; the businessman himself is to blame if the public never hears of his problems. The media is always quick to tell us of the enormous profits of some companies, of the huge salaries of its top employees, and of course of all the scandals that may happen within a large, successful corporation.

Only occasionally does one hear references to the myriad of government regulations that are being imposed on the largest, most successful businesses, and never is a protest heard from the men who are affected by such regulations. If labor, for example, has a grievance about anything at all, one can be sure that it will make itself heard one way or another. Labor is well organized with a large and influential lobbyist group in Washington that can practically dictate its wishes to an equally large number of Congressmen. Labor has an efficient political machine in all the industrial and many other states as well that can elect practically any man that it pleases. But does business have any counterpart to all these successful, influential devices that labor employs? Yes, claim the businessmen, pointing to the National Association of Manufacturers and the Committee for Economic Development, which is composed of and financed by businessmen. Yet the NAM has little if any influence in Congress or anywhere else, and the CED's

true interests have been questioned by those who know it.¹ The truth is that business, the heart of American free enterprise and democracy, has sadly neglected its duty of informing the public of its motives and problems. The public opinion will follow, for the most part, what it hears and reads in the national media, and when what little it hears about big business is derogatory, deceiving, or even down-right dishonest, then how can it be expected to have big business' best interests at heart?

The place where business and economic education should first take place is, of course, the school. The opinions and prejudices learned in school, especially high school, are likely to remain with a person most of his life. But it would be safe to say that no such course is required until at least the senior year, and even then it is merely a subjective comparison extolling the greatness of our system without ever explaining objectively the reasons why democracy, along with free enterprise is essential to keep the freedoms we all take for granted (obviously, I speak through experience). The people of our country must understand our system and the consequences of losing it before it can be honored and defended as it must be to survive.

What has resulted from the public misunderstanding of the vital functions of our economic system and the problems of big business is probably the most backward feeling that could appear in a capitalistic, democratic society: the fact that the businessman has come to the point where he is afraid to admit that he makes a profit. Supposedly, one works and lives to be successful at whatever one chooses to do. Therefore, it would be theoretically logical that the more success that is achieved, the better and happier one's life should be. The successful businessman would naturally be making a profit that reflects his amount of success. Yet the public opinion of a man who makes "too much" money is a sneering, jealous one.

Our society has come to believe that not only are all men created equal, but that all men should remain equal regardless of their ambitions and success. Granted, a great deal of wealth is inherited—but wealth is rarely a thing that is self-perpetuating if in the wrong hands. The great injustice that is occurring today in our country is that people have come to expect something for nothing. They expect that if they have no ambition or drive, then it is the duty of those who do have drive, who are successful, to take care of the lazy and inept. We are taught from early childhood that just as great, rich America must pay to feed most of the rest of the world, so must the rich and successful businesses of our nation be scorned and degraded for helping those who cannot or will not help themselves. Thus the word "profit", which is synonymous with success, has become a dirty word in most people's language. Those who make too large a profit must hide it or lose it to the government in the name of equality.

Now, that the reasons for the decline and misunderstanding of the free enterprise system have become clear, the solution to the problem becomes equally clear. Business must make it a point to educate the public about the free enterprise system and its es-

¹ In a report put out by the CED that could be used as a textbook for economics instruction, the following phrases appeared: "The problem of enforcing reasonable competition is a complex and difficult one." "Individual economic incentives in the Communist countries do not differ greatly from those in the American economy." "... those countries... that have adopted Socialism... are not any less democratic in their form of government."

sential link to democracy. Business must not be afraid to have its own lobbyists, its own pressure groups, and its own friendly sources in the media. Business cannot go on having more and more restrictive regulations imposed upon it. Business cannot have only its taxes raised higher and higher—it isn't the job or duty of business to pay for the very government which is attempting to over-restrict it. The public must be aware that big, rich business is vitally important for everyone, that business needs public support and appreciation of its problems to operate efficiently. There is no reason why each and every American citizen should not be able to tell why he needs democracy and free enterprise—but I believe that it would be safe to bet that a large majority of the people have never even given it a thought.

My own beliefs in the will of the majority of the people prevailing while keeping the right of the individual intact is so strong that I will defend democracy in any manner possible. And since free enterprise is the only economic system that can exist in a true democracy, then free enterprise is as valuable to me as the freedoms I enjoy under a democratic government. The trouble in America is that too many people take these basic liberties which exist only in America completely for granted. As has happened in too many other countries, no one realizes what a good thing they have had until it's gone—and then, it is usually too late. Maybe the American people haven't been earning their liberty; maybe they don't really care. But certainly if everyone has the chance to learn a little, to realize that they "can't have their cake and eat it, too", then maybe free enterprise will still have a chance to survive in its first and ultimately last refuge. I hope the people of America can change their attitudes before they lose what I hope is their most prized possession—the freedom of their minds.

FORRESTER URGES MEMBERS TO CONSIDER INTERRELATEDNESS

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, Dr. Jay Forrester of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, spoke to over 50 of our colleagues as part of the "Dialogues on America's Future" series sponsored by the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future.

Professor Forrester is a pioneer in computer technology and is founder of the systems dynamics group at MIT. He enlightened and enlivened us, Mr. Speaker, as he urged us in the Congress to view our problems more holistically.

I am delighted to have the opportunity to insert into the Record today part of the transcript of our session with Dr. Forrester. The conclusion of the doctor's remarks will be in the next issue of the Record. And I urge all of our colleagues to read it.

The text of the presentation follows:

JAY FORRESTER'S OPENING REMARKS

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, and thank you very much for asking me to participate in this exciting series. I would like to begin by saying that the industrial countries are in a period of growing economic instability. Symptoms of social and economic stress appear in such forms as the deepest recession since World War II and in simultaneous inflation and unemployment. Such

economic cross currents create political confusion and public disenchantment with national leaderships. In times like these, causes and remedies are urgently sought. But the economic system is complex, conflicting theories abound, and a desperate search for simple solutions can easily lead to wrong answers.

The search for answers has concentrated on the most apparent characteristic of national economies—the short-term business cycle, which exhibits peaks of activity at intervals of three to seven years. Business cycles are familiar; most people have experienced several; changes during the business cycle occur fast enough to be readily observed; and economic research has focused on business cycles while neglecting longer-term economic behavior. But familiarity need not be equivalent to importance.

As a consequence of over-emphasis on business cycles, almost all variations in economic behavior have been attributed to the business cycle.

But these assertions may be incorrect. If so, it is because the business cycle is but one aspect, and probably the least important aspect, of present economic turbulence.

Two time horizons, both much longer than the business cycle, are necessary to understand the present environment for industrial enterprise. The longest frame of reference is the life cycle of growth within which population and industrialization expand until restrained by environmental limits. The intermediate frame of reference is a long-wave fluctuation in capital accumulation and technological change that expands and contracts over a period of some fifty years.

Implications of the life cycle of growth underlie many current issues. The life cycle process involves a collision between growing human demands and environmental limits.

The life cycle of growth is the central theme of World Dynamics and Limits to Growth, two books that show how it has now become possible to improve understanding of social and economic change. Industrial nations are entering the mature phase of their life cycle in which the historical forces of growth in population and industrialization are being subdued by the counter pressures from limits to land, food, resources, energy, water, and capacity to dissipate pollution. The resolution of the clash between man and nature must eventually come by man's learning to live within nature's boundaries. The fundamental tradeoff is between population and standard of living.

During the last five years, the dynamics of growth have indeed penetrated into business thought and debate in the press. But the intermediate dynamics of long wave economic changes have received far less attention than they deserve.

From recent work at MIT with computer models of the processes of economic change, we are coming to believe that a long wave exists in the market-type of industrial economies. The disturbance recurs at intervals of about 50 years between peaks. Very little agreement yet exists about the long-wave phenomenon. Many people deny that it exists. I will give you my personal current understanding arising from research that is still in progress. Future work may alter some of the ideas I will present.

THE LONG WAVE

The long wave has been treated most extensively in the literature by the Russian economist Nikolai Kondratieff.

Dynamics of the long wave can be seen by starting with the industrial economies in 1945. After the Great Depression and World War II, every aspect of capital plant was inadequate. Consumer durables, housing, office buildings, factories, transportation systems, and schools were old and inadequate. To rebuild the depleted capital stock in a short time, like 20 years, construction of housing and equipment rose to a rate higher than

would be needed in the long run for replacing the physical depreciation of capital plant. But when adequate capital plant had been created, a time that may have occurred in the 1960's, tremendous forces persisted to sustain capital accumulation. Labor unions wanted to continue construction, companies in the capital sector sold their output more effectively and extended more credit, banks had been successful in loaning on new capital plant and wanted to continue, and Central Banks increased the money supply in the name of sustaining economic growth. The result has been an unbalancing of the system with too much capital expansion and too much debt. Eventually, momentum must falter as capital plant becomes more and more excessive. It is probable that enough capital plant now exists to sustain consumption output for one or two decades with little new additional investment. I believe excess capital plant explains why capital expenditure has been weak in the present recovery. The need for capital plant is far less than 20 years ago.

Using the long wave and the life cycle of growth as perspectives beyond that provided by the business cycle, the present social and economic environment takes on new dimensions.

ISSUES WE FACE

1. Monetary control of business cycles. Until recently people believed business cycles had been suppressed by skillful management of the money supply. But the evidence may have been misinterpreted. During the rising phase of the long wave, capital plant is inadequate, demand presses against supply, capital shortage suppresses the tops of the business cycles, and cyclic corrections in inventories and employment are minor. The situation may have been like the coincidence of the ancient Chinese observing that fire-crackers drove away eclipses of the moon. In each minor recession monetary adjustments were made and a business upturn followed. But it may only have been coincidence. Business would have had a strong and quick recovery anyway from the buoyancy caused by the underlying wave of capital accumulation.

2. High unemployment. Present unusual levels of unemployment probably arise more from the long wave than from the business cycle. Unemployment seems most severe in construction and those industries closely associated with capital investment. If so, the problem is not temporary, nor should it be treated by temporary measures. The signals suggest need for a major shift of people from capital goods and finance into consumer products and agriculture. But government-created job programs motivated by belief that unemployment is temporary may trap a generation of people as wards of the government and isolate them from effective participation in the economy. Instead, a clear vision of a viable future must be created toward which the economy can move. Temporary social assistance should help, not hinder, inevitable realignments within the economy.

3. Stimulation of national economies. Conventional wisdom and political expediency combine to exert pressure for increasing financial credit. Behind such pressures lies a belief that more capital construction will revive the economy and that more money will induce more capital expenditure. But such ideas, if ever valid, applied to a time of shortage in physical capital. More freely available credit has little leverage where unused equipment and floor space stand idle.

4. Inflation. But increasing money supply can have an effect. Even if it does not reduce unemployment, it can produce inflation. The idea that a tradeoff exists between inflation and unemployment is a hypothesis taken from the context of the short-term business cycle. When transported into the context of the long wave, increasing money supply prob-

ably generates inflation to accompany the unemployment, without reducing unemployment.

5. Bank vulnerability. Banking is caught in pressures created by the long wave. Early in the upswing, as in the 1950's, loans were made for high return-on-investment purposes and limited availability of credit restrained loans for lower quality purposes. As need for plant and equipment was met, return-on-investment declined, fewer opportunities became available for secure high-yielding loans, money supply increased, and loans were made for purposes that did not generate the capacity to pay back the debt. In the extreme case, loans were channeled for support of current consumption as in consumer credit, loans for current municipal expenses, and loans to support current consumption and social welfare programs in underdeveloped countries. Measures of banking strength have declined as a result of financial institutions attempting to loan as aggressively in the last part of the long wave upswing as they had safely been able to do at the beginning of the upturn.

6. Social pressures. Businessmen complain of increasing government regulation and public hostility. But such changes cannot be understood from a short-term perspective. Some changes in social values appear cyclical and rise and fall in step with economic pressures of the long wave. There is some indication of 50-year cyclic changes in conservative vs. liberal politics, women's liberation movements, anti-trust action, and political isolationism. Other of today's social pressures on business arise from the life cycle of growth. Environmental concerns, falling birth rate, and pollution legislation are best interpreted as belonging to the transition from growth to equilibrium. Much of government regulation has been precipitated by the growth of industrial enterprises and by the crowding of people into limited space that increases friction and litigation.

ENERGY

7. Energy policy. In energy we have had the wood-burning cycle, the coal-burning cycle, and the oil-burning cycle. Each of these has reached a crest, fallen to minor usage, and been replaced by a new energy source and new technology. We are near the end of the oil cycle. The peak of the next energy technology is probably some 50 years ahead. Our problem today is to look that far ahead and know what to do now. Traditionally the dilemma has been solved by struggling through a major depression, letting the old technology wear out, and waiting until sporadic development and experimentation had demonstrated the road up the next wave of capital investment. If we do not want to live through the traditional process of faltering and recovering, we must succeed in looking across the 50-year valley, perceiving the structure of the future, and beginning to build now. That is far different from the usual industrial practice of building directly on current technology. Present failure to establish effective energy policy arises from trying to build on a past that cannot survive, while looking no more than a decade or two into the future where only decline of the present system is clearly visible. Guidance lies further out where we must think in terms of a society with energy of a different kind, built around a new infrastructure of technical support systems and social relationships.

8. Capital vs. Labor. Present industrial enterprises have developed over three decades of sustained emphasis on capital-intensive production and replacing people with machinery. But to believe such capital-intensive emphasis will continue is based on a short view of history. The upswing in the long wave is characterized by capital-intensive production. While the capital sectors are growing, they attract labor from the consumer sectors, produce a labor shortage, and

raise wages. Labor shortage and higher wages create incentives for more capital plant and the capital sectors grow still faster. But in time the capital needs are met, even overfilled. Excess capital plant develops in the consumer sectors and labor becomes available from decline in the capital sectors. After the peak of the long wave, production in consumer sectors can be increased more efficiently by adding labor rather than by adding capital. Emphasis shifts to more labor-intensive production. The shift from adding capital to adding labor seems now to be happening in some industries.

9. Productivity. Much concern is currently expressed because labor productivity is not rising as in the past. Productivity has usually risen at the beginning of a business-cycle recovery, but has not shown much improvement in the present recovery. The answer may lie in the long wave. During the 1950's and 1960's productivity rose because capital plant was inadequate and added capital increased productivity. But now it is probable that capital needs are mostly satisfied and in only a few places will more capital plant increase productivity. At the same time, as capacity exceeds demand, the social incentives for more output are weakened. Deliveries are good, backlogs are low, pressure to produce is moderate, and slow production seems to spread work into the future and protect jobs. Circumstances at the top of the long wave are very different from those in the early phase of the upswing.

10. Communications. Two questions arise in connection with dynamics of change that run their course over a period of decades. First, can such dynamic modes have persisted for almost two centuries in the presence of faster and better communication? To answer, the long-wave behavior depends on the time to plan and acquire capital plant, the life of capital plant, the lifetime of people, and the length of time it takes people to acknowledge and accept change. These elements in the socio-economic system have not been altered substantially by faster communication. And the second question, will not better communication make information more timely and lead to better decisions? The reverse can occur. The media provides a flood of information—too much information. Information of fleeting interest drives out and submerges information of enduring significance. It can be shown in behavior of a social system that information can do harm as easily by being too fast and excessive as by being too late and insufficient. I believe we now suffer from too much superficial information. Long-term changes in our economic system are more important than those that come and go quickly. The historical perspective from which to judge major trends and reversals is lost in the flood of daily details.

UNCERTAINTY

11. Uncertainty. We are bothered by the unpredictable, like bad weather, if we have created a socio-economic system that is increasingly sensitive to random events; by contrast, a system with slack and reserves can absorb uncertainty without trauma. Economic behavior is uncontrollable to the extent that we do not devote skill and effort to understanding the system and finding the leverage points that can make it better behaved. I believe such better understanding is now possible.

12. Threat. Historically, nations have perceived threat in the form of military invasion. But in times of great social and economic stress, the greatest threat comes from internal breakdown.

The principal threat is internal political breakdown. Yet all nations spend vastly more to protect against external military threat than to understand and relieve internal social and economic threat. Military research and socio-economic research are grossly out of balance.

CUBA'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer recently reported in an article dated July 4, 1977, that Fidel Castro has more political prisoners per capita than does the Soviet Union. This is not surprising to those of us who follow events in Cuba.

What is surprising, however, is the seeming deaf, dumb, and blind approach of the Carter administration to recognition of Communist Cuba. In spite of his recent release of some Americans held on drug charges, Castro has released no noted political prisoner. The litmus test was and is Huber Matos. On December 18, 1976 the Chilean Government offered to trade the former leader of the Chilean Communist Party Jorge Montes for Huber Matos. There was no response. Two different groups of Congressmen sent letters to Castro asking the release of Matos—the last one containing the signatures of 100 Members of Congress. Chile finally turned Montes over to East Germany in return for 11 West Germans held in East German jails. Castro has not and will not reform. He only wants our American money to bail out his sagging economy. The article from the National Observer of July 4, 1977, follows:

CUBA'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

(By Frank Calzon)

Watched closely by soldiers, they travel in huge army convoys, often sleep on bare floors, eat only watery soup, and work more than 80 hours a week. When there are no roads to build, they cut sugar cane, work in quarries, construct houses or prisons, or—wait deep in swamps, their skins puffy and eyes swollen by mosquito bites—they toil in drainage projects.

Their belongings fill a bag the size of a pillow case. Many have lost their teeth because of poor diets and lack of dental care. Some have died during the grueling *cordilleras*, or convoys.

According to official Cuban publications, their output is worth several hundred million dollars a year, making them Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's most-productive labor force.

They are Cuba's "rehabilitated" prisoners, those who have recanted anti-Castro political ideas and have pledged loyalty to the Havana regime. They are the better off of Cuba's two categories of political prisoner.

MORE THAN RUSSIA

The *plantados*, the group, are those who refuse to co-operate with Castro's government. They receive especially harsh treatment, which may include no visits by family, confinement to dark cells for months, no regular correspondence, and often no medical treatment. And because of their "dangerousness," their prison terms may be extended when their sentences are completed.

The plight of political dissidents in such countries as Russia and Chile has gained world-wide attention, particularly since President Carter began his human-rights crusade. Yet, according to Castro's own figures, Cuba holds five to eight times as many political prisoners per capita as does Russia. And most neutral observers peg Castro's figures as far too low.

In a recent interview on U.S. television, Castro said Cuba had between 2,000 and 3,000

political prisoners. President Carter put that figure at between 15,000 and 20,000. Prof. Edward Gonzales of the University of California at Los Angeles, after visiting Cuba, wrote in 1974 that Castro's jails held between 25,000 and 80,000 political prisoners. Soviet dissident Andrei Sakharov estimates that Russia, with a population of 250 million to Cuba's 9.5 million has about 10,000 political prisoners.

UNDERPOPULATED JAILS?

Official Cuban reports also cast doubt on Castro's figures. For example, Havana has acknowledged it has 56 prisons and jails, 23 work camps, and 108 penal farms. If so, that would mean that by Castro's figures each institution holds only 10 to 15 prisoners.

Bohemia, a Cuban-government publication, reported that political prisoners, "besides their contribution to agriculture and specifically the sugar harvest," were involved in the following projects in 1973:

In Havana Province, they built 3 high schools, 135 dairy farms, 6 cattle-raising centers, and 344 housing units and other projects.

In Pinar, del Rio Province, they were building 48 housing units and 8 high schools as well as working in a prefabricated-materials factory, 2 carpentry shops, and 4 state establishments.

In Matanzas Province, they built a dairy farm, pig-breeding farm, prefabricated-pieces factory, mortar factory, and carpentry shop, and enlarged two penal institutions.

The labor needed for such projects would indicate that Castro's jails hold many more political prisoners than he has acknowledged.

More than half of Cuba's political prisoners are peasants unhappy with Castro's agrarian policies. Most reportedly are serving terms ranging up to 20 years.

Punishment can be severe for those who rile Castro. Rene Dumont, a French leftist who once served as an agricultural consultant in Cuba, tells about one young peasant in his book *Is Cuba Socialist?* "A young sentinel guarding some new rice plantings had one night let cows graze amidst them, and Castro wanted to have him shot," Dumont wrote. Castro "was restrained with difficulty by being reminded that the grazing would in fact encourage plant growth. Once over his rage, Castro agreed to have the sentence changed to 15 years in a prison farm."

Even after a political prisoner completes his term and presumably affirms his loyalty to Castro, his freedom is limited. Generally a political prisoner is barred from returning to his original province and from access to higher education. If he was a professional, generally he can't practice that profession—medicine is an exception—but is required to work on a farm or at a menial industrial task.

The travails of Sakharov and other Soviet dissidents have long been reported outside of Russia. But the plight of several Cuban plantados—from a Spanish word meaning "to stand firm"—only recently has come to light.

NUDE FOR TWO YEARS

One is Huber Matos, a former major and provincial military commander in Castro's army who played a key role in the guerrilla campaign that brought Castro to power on Jan. 1, 1959. Later that year Matos was sentenced to 20 years in prison for resigning his commission to protest the growing number of Communist cadres in Castro's government.

According to a document Matos' wife, Maria Luisa, presented in 1975 to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, Matos "has been kept incommunicado for periods of more than one year. He has been the victim of countless abuses and humiliations. Because he refused to accept a program of indoctrination, he was forced to live nude for two years. In February of 1970 he was isolated in a dark cell with a small window covered with a heavy cloth stitched to the

bars. I do not know if the situation persists since for the past five years he has not been allowed to receive visitors."

More than 100 U.S. congressmen wrote twice to Castro earlier this year pleading for Matos' release. They received no response. More than 40 members of the Venezuelan Congress recently appealed to Castro for the release of Armando Valladares, a 40-year-old poet imprisoned since 1960.

CELL ROW NO. 12

In February 1970 Valladares was transferred to Boniato Prison in Oriente Province, where, according to his wife, "beatings, starvation, physical and mental tortures were taking place." Mrs. Valladares says her husband's cell block was sealed by metal plates that blocked windows and doors. He was transferred to La Cabana Prison, two years later.

At La Cabana, according to the Organization of American States' Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, "44 Cuban political prisoners were punished and deprived of food and medical assistance in cell row No. 12. . . . Some of them were gravely ill." Because of lack of food, says Mrs. Valladares, "six men were paralyzed by polyneuritis. . . . Armando Valladares was one of them."

Valladares is now confined to a wheel chair. "My husband's paralysis can be cured by adequate nourishment, therapy, and exercises, which have not been provided because of his refusal to accept the government's rehabilitation plan," says Mrs. Valladares.

PRISON RIOT

Pedro Luis Boite, who served as a student leader and urban-underground organizer in Castro's guerrilla war, also was a plantado. "In May of 1972," according to the OAS' human-rights commission, "Pedro Luis Boitel, still a prisoner in the El Principe Castle in Havana, was seriously ill as a result of maltreatment and torture to which he continued to be subjected. . . . On May 28, the commission received a communication informing it that he had died in prison."

Boitel died without medical attention, while his fellow prisoners, unable to save him, rioted, burning their mattresses. The National Catholic News Service reported that "prison officials damaged his spine during beatings . . . when he went on a hunger strike he was transferred to a security cell and told, 'This time we will let you die, no doctors.'"

By the time of his death, Boitel had become a symbol inside Cuba. In a poem smuggled out of prison, Miguel Sales, now serving a 20-year sentence, wrote, "They finally killed your 96 pounds of pure bone and heart . . . they walled up your smile . . . with hunger they blocked off your eyes . . . they drowned your name-legend. May your assassins rest in peace."

TWICE AN ESCAPEE

Nine years old when Castro came to power, Sales is a poet who has twice escaped from Cuba. The first time, in 1968, he fled with 11 others on a motorboat, but was picked up by a Soviet trawler off the Florida coast. Returned to Cuba, he was sentenced to prison until his 21st birthday.

The second time, in 1975, he swam for seven hours at night before reaching the U.S. base at Guantanamo. After being reunited with his parents in Florida, he decided to return to Cuba to rescue his wife and baby daughter. He was captured and sentenced to 25 years in prison. His poetry has won a prize in an American competition. One section entitled *Celular* (an allusion to Cuba's prison cells) is dedicated to his fellow prisoners who died in jail.

Theodore Jacqueney, an American journalist who visited Cuba last year as a guest of the Havana government, interviewed several dissidents and former prisoners. "As in the men's prisons," he wrote, "the women

political prisoners report deplorable medical inattention, with deprivation of health care sometimes used to coerce prisoners." Jacqueney tells of one woman prisoner who was not permitted to have a desperately needed cancer operation "until she promised to change her political ideas and attitudes."

And thus, a relative of the woman told Jacqueney, "she was rehabilitated."

WHO OWNS THE PRESS?

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 2 of this year I rose to voice my concern over the increasing phenomenon of independent media outlets—newspapers, TV and radio stations—being absorbed into a comparatively few centralized chains. To underscore my own concern, I introduced into the RECORD the newspaper article, "Who Owns the Press?" by journalist Charles B. Seib, writing for the Washington Post.

The gist of Mr. Seib's thought-provoking article was that centralized ownership of newspapers and broadcast facilities was becoming a prevailing occurrence throughout the country; newspapers and stations were increasingly unable to compete financially on an independent basis. The article was meant not as a criticism of chain ownership, per se, but rather as a warning against one of its potential dangers: Loss of local autonomy as an independent paper or station was swallowed up by a conglomerate communications "empire." Ownership implies the opportunity to control, and the ominous result could be a kind of communications dictatorship, wherein what we were allowed to read and hear would be determined by a handful of industry "barons." Freedom of press and speech could be, in effect, limited to those few. I can see that implication as a very real threat, and I wanted to call it to the attention of my colleagues so that we all might recognize the potential danger.

To serve its community effectively, a newspaper or TV/radio station must be reflective of that community—local philosophies and local issues must be responded to. If a newspaper or announcer presents only the views and policies formulated by the central owner, who may be many thousands of miles away both geographically and philosophically, the community is not being properly served. Moreover, it would be neither fair nor healthy for a chain ownership to force its viewpoints upon local communities. To wit, a chain ownership headquartered in a large metropolitan area may not always be able to perceive the concerns of smaller cities, towns, or rural regions. A degree of local autonomy is essential to successful operation of any media outlet. Without that autonomy, the audience ceases to identify with the media and comes to distrust and disbelieve what it reads and hears.

However, it is by no means true that the threat has become reality in every case of a chain-owned media outlet. Many newspapers and broadcast stations

have been absorbed into chains without being "swallowed up." They have successfully retained local independence—in editorial policies and management philosophies. As a result, they have profited from their affiliation, achieving the best of both worlds.

In fact, many independent outlets have deferred affiliation with a chain until local autonomy was guaranteed. The individuals who operate these outlets are to be commended, not only for their professionalism but for providing us with evidence of how chain ownership or outlet affiliations can and should work within our communications industry.

I can cite cases of such success within my own congressional district. There are numerous examples of newspapers in the Fourth District of Florida that have wrought the best aspects of chain membership, while retaining the necessary independence to make the paper meaningful to and reflective of the local community. The major key to their success is the integrity, professionalism, and assertiveness of the people who actually put out those papers—the local editors, publishers, and reporters. I am sure that the majority of my colleagues could point to many similar examples within their own districts, and I am certain the explanation would be the same: courage and hard work by the local journalists to maintain local independence and relevance in the service of their communities.

When I originally introduced the subject of chain ownership within the media, my intention—like that of the article's author, Mr. Seib—was not to categorically condemn a trend, but to warn against one dangerous implication of that trend. Today I applaud those individuals who have managed to exercise their independence within the boundaries of chain membership and whose dedication and professional integrity have successfully maintained first amendment rights and prevented our local communities from becoming mere fiefdoms in communications "baronies." I hope this independence will be the pattern for the present and future.

Unfortunately, we also have evidence that in some cases the hazard has become reality. I offer for the record another newspaper article, taken from yesterday's Washington Star-News. The piece, I believe, speaks for itself, and thus I will not further comment except to say once again that with more and more centralized ownership goes the "opportunity" for more and more centralized control.

EDITORS FIRED FOR REFUSING MCGOFF EDICT

LANSING, Mich.—John P. McGoff, who heads companies that publish eight daily newspapers and more than 40 weeklies in several states, has discharged two of his Michigan editors after they failed to obey orders to run provocative articles that were highly critical of President Carter.

One of the articles said the President condoned promiscuity among members of his staff. The other suggested he was grooming his wife, Rosalynn, to be a future vice president.

They were written by George Bernard, New York bureau chief for McGoff's Panax newspaper chain, and were distributed to his newspapers two weeks ago along with a

front-office memorandum labeling them "explosive" and urging that they be given front-page display.

A number of McGoff's editors followed orders last week and gave prominent display to the two articles written by Bernard, a 38-year-old former writer for the National Enquirer and more recently a public information officer for CBS Radio News.

Two who balked, however, were Robert N. Skuggens, 34, editor of Mining Journal, a 19,000-circulation daily in Marquette, Mich., and David A. Rood, 51, editor of the Escanaba Daily Press, which has a circulation of 11,000.

Rood, dismissed last Monday, said later that the material in Bernard's articles "was taken out of context and was full of half-truths, insinuations and every other innuendo you can think of."

Skuggens, who was notified June 19 that his undated resignation had been accepted, said, "That type of journalism I can't stomach. I wouldn't be able to shave in the morning."

Both editors had won journalism awards in recent Michigan news writing contests, and both were well respected in state press circles.

McGoff, 52, acknowledged as much later this week but said they were discharged because they had ignored his orders. He described his action as "one that any good leader should exercise."

(Panax this year acquired the Globe-Advertiser weekly publications in suburban Washington. The Globe ran both stories on June 9, while the Advertiser ran only the one about Mrs. Carter on June 8.)

The first article carried a Washington dateline and began: "President James Earl Carter condones promiscuity—affairs with other women—for the male staffers who work for him."

The contention was based on a "leak to Panax newspapers" from Peter Bourne, who, according to Bernard's article, is "a psychiatrist who is on the administration's payroll to make Jimmy Carter look good."

In Washington, Bourne, a special assistant to the President for mental health and drug abuse, said, "I can't recall saying anything to anybody about that subject."

The second article quoted a New York psychologist, William Van Precht, as saying that Carter was giving his wife "inordinate power" and "has in mind a hidden objective."

Van Precht was further quoted as saying, "My careful analysis says that Jimmy Carter is grooming wife Rosalynn for the vice presidency in 1984. And if Walter Mondale's health does not hold out through the ominous year of 'Big Brother,' Carter will push his bride to become the president of the United States."

Bernard worked for five years in the 1960s for the National Enquirer, a tabloid dealing with celebrities and sensational topics.

Bernard later worked for CBS Radio News as manager of press services, leaving in 1972.

ONE WAY TO PROTECT AGAINST TORNADOES

HON. ROBERT A. YOUNG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the great natural disasters that regularly though unpredictably is inflicted on our citizenry is the tornado, which wreaks countless damage, destruction, and death. Though no part of the

country is immune, tornadoes' impact tends to be forced in the Midwestern States, ranging from Texas to Michigan. Several years ago, my own home in St. Ann, Mo., a St. Louis suburb, was damaged by a tornado.

We have just ended what might be called the "tornado season"—the months of May and June, when a large percentage of all such storms can be expected to occur. But for future reference, I found a great deal of interesting and useful information about tornadoes and what can be done to protect people from their devastating whim, in the May 1977, issue of Science Digest magazine.

Because of the dangers implicit in the tornado threat, I was particularly attracted to the article, entitled "Here Is How To Use Your Own TV To Locate Twisters." The essentials of this informative article are offered here for the benefit of American citizens everywhere to help them protect themselves. I believe that the publication of the article is a genuine service, which I commend:

Twenty years ago, a self-taught Des Moines engineer, Newton Weller, started studying the electrical properties of tornadoes. At the time, his goal was to invent and patent an electronic tornado detector that could take him out of his basement workshop and make him rich.

However, Weller ran into a problem that plagues most inventors: he could not afford the equipment he needed to build his prototype. Not to be defeated, he tried to adapt the chassis from an old television set.

Weller soon realized that the circuits in the TV chassis can be used just as they are. In fact, after researching the scientific literature on tornadoes, he discovered that any working television set can be adjusted to detect tornadoes by picking up high-frequency electrical pulses, which they emit in abundance.

In 1968, Weller published his technique for adjusting television set controls for tornado detection. Only days later, a vicious tornado struck nearby Orange City. Many a resident, having read of the method, adjusted his own set, saw the "Weller effect," and became a convert.

The Weller Method—as it is now called—can be used by anyone. It requires no special tools and can be done by adjusting any black-and-white or color set, using the controls on the front. Do not open the set or use controls located in the back. Here is how to do it:

First, warm up the set. Turn up the "contrast" control all the way so people look like silhouettes. Then turn to channel 13—it doesn't matter whether or not channel 13 carries a picture. Using the "brightness" control, darken the picture so it is almost black.

At that point, you change to channel — again, it doesn't matter if channel 2 receives broadcasts in your area—and you are set to watch for tornadoes.

According to Weller, a ground-level tornado strong enough to do damage will make the screen light up and glow brightly when the tornado is 15 to 20 miles away. If channel 2 is broadcasting a picture, he says, it will come on brightly and stay on. Should this happen, don't sit there staring at the screen in amazement at how the technique worked. Take cover: In the bottom of your house, away from windows.

Weller also advises that windows be opened an inch to relieve the severe air pressure generated by tornadoes. And, he says, you should turn off the television set, and take a portable radio with you to listen to news broadcasts telling you when the tornado alert is over.

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress passed Public Law 93-82, the Veterans' Health Care Expansion Act of 1973, it mandated that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct "an extensive review and appraisal of personnel and other resource requirements in Veterans' Administration hospitals, clinics, and other medical facilities to determine a basis for the optimum numbers and categories of such personnel and other resources needed to insure the provision to eligible veterans of high quality care in all hospitals, medical, domiciliary, and nursing home facilities."

Earlier this month, the Academy submitted their report on this study to the House and Senate Veterans' Affairs Committees. While there has not been enough time to fully review the results of this study, many of the conclusions and recommendations made by the Academy are extremely disturbing. Perhaps the most disturbing recommendation made by the Academy was that "VA policies and programs should be designed to permit the VA system ultimately to be phased into the general delivery of health service in communities across the country."

The findings and conclusions the Academy made which lead to this recommendation are voluminous and complex. Many of the findings made in the Academy's report will prove beneficial to the Veterans' Administration in the continuing effort to improve the quality of care available to our Nation's veterans. Nevertheless, I believe the Academy made a major mistake by departing from past policies and recommending the incorporation of VA health services with community health services.

The Congress and past administrations have supported the independence of the Veterans' Administration medical system since World War I when it was first established. This support is based on the belief that our veterans deserve special consideration and compassion. To place VA medical services in the same category as Medicare and Medicaid would only result in the elimination of the special treatment which is only available in VA facilities.

It would be premature at this point to discuss in detail any specifics. However, I would like to remind the Congress that a recent study made by the VA showed that—

An overwhelming majority of patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics believe they are receiving the best care possible.

In my opinion, this would not be true if the Academy's recommendations were adopted by Congress.

Due to the complexities involved with this issue, and to the nature of the Academy's recommendations, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Medical Facilities and Benefits, of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

which I am a member, should hold over-sight hearings on this subject before the Congress recesses in August. I, therefore, urge the leadership of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to work expeditiously toward this goal.

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ON CAPITOL HILL—THE FIGHT GOES ON**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, after a disabled constituent in a wheelchair faced great difficulty and embarrassment in trying to visit me in my office in the Longworth Building, I launched an investigation into the architectural accessibility of facilities on Capitol Hill. At that time, I found that barriers at building entrances and restrooms facilities and sidewalk curbs combined to discourage greatly any handicapped person using ambulatory aids from attempting to visit their elected Representatives or their Nation's Capitol Building.

Since then, extensive modifications have been taking place to increase architectural accessibility on Capitol Hill. Most evident has been the removal of curbs at street cross sections and the installation of ramps at building entrances. Nonetheless, I recently received correspondence from a disabled author and scholar, who is a resident of Maryland, regarding the difficulties he has faced in using another facility here on Capitol Hill—the Library of Congress. Knowing of my deep concern and past actions in opposition to architectural barriers, he contacted me with his observations and problems in using the Library.

I am appending copies of his correspondence with the Library, and my subsequent letter to Dr. Daniel Boorstin, Librarian of Congress, to point out that although some steps have been taken to be sensitive to the needs of disabled citizens who are confronted with architectural barriers, the fight must continue until all Federal facilities can be freely used by all persons.

JUNE 29, 1977.

HON. DANIEL J. BOORSTIN,
The Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BOORSTIN: I am writing to bring your attention to an issue I know you are as concerned about as I am, which is the equal accessibility of the nation's library, the Library of Congress.

For disabled individuals and many elderly citizens, architectural accessibility is an absolute requirement if they wish to enjoy the same freedom of movement and access accorded other Americans. I understand from the enclosed correspondence from Mr. Hugh Gallagher, a disabled author, and Mr. Edmund L. Applebaum, Library Director, that plans for increasing architectural accessibility of the Library are underway. These modifications are long-overdue accommodations to the needs of our handicapped citizens and I commend your efforts in this direction.

At the same time, I urge you to continue to remain sensitive to the needs of disabled

June 29, 1977

Library users, and to consider expanding your program of parking proximate to the facility to include spaces for weekday hours. This would be of great help to disabled Library users who are working on extended projects that require weekday work, and those who need the resources of your Library research staff, who are not available on weekends, holidays, or evenings.

I am glad that the Library of Congress is taking active steps to remedy the problems of architectural access of their facility, and hope for continuing progress in the future. I would appreciate being advised as to your views on this parking facility proposal.

All the best.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

H. G. GALLAGHER,
Cabin John, Md., May 12, 1977.

DR. DANIEL J. BOORSTIN,
The Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress,
10 First Street SE., Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. BOORSTIN: I write to you concerning the problems faced by handicapped, citizens who wish to make use of the Library of Congress. I know of your interest in improving the accessibility of the Library. I know that there is now an accessible toilet stall in the major rest rooms, and I am pleased that a lap board is available for the use of wheelchair scholars. These are small but helpful steps in the right direction. Since the passage of the Bartlett Act in 1968 it has been the law of the land that federal buildings, including those of the legislature, should be accessible to the handicapped. The Act has been strengthened by the Congress, and the recent regulations issued by Secretary Callfano provide impressive guidelines for the use of executive agencies. The Architect of the Capitol, acting at the direction of the Congress, has done a great deal over the last several years to improve matters in the Congressional buildings. I am sure that the Library wishes to keep pace with the progress being made by the Congress and the executive branch.

I am a writer and a scholar, and I have been confined to a wheelchair for over twenty years. Because I make regular use of the Library I believe that my observations may be of help to you as you consider means for improving Library services to handicapped users.

There are three obvious, serious complaints to be made:

(1) The ramp at the west entrance is exceedingly dangerous. It is pitched at something close to a 45 degree angle, and exceeds GSA ramp angle specifications by something like ten-fold. Even with the assistance of two able-bodied persons it is dangerous to attempt to push a wheelchair up that ramp. It is clearly impossible for the unassisted independent handicapped person to use.

(2) You were kind enough last year to allow the handicapped to make use of your own reserved parking place when you yourself were not using it; i.e., in the evening and on Sundays. Unfortunately, the parking lot guards do not know this.

Many of the guards will not allow a handicapped person to park in an available spot, even in the evening or on weekends. This week, in fact, my driver and I were not allowed the time necessary for me to get from my car to the wheelchair, even though my driver had made it clear to the guard that he intended to park my car elsewhere.

(3) Although there is a parking space reserved for the handicapped on evenings and Sundays, the space is in the west parking lot and the sole Library ramp which conforms to GSA standards (and is therefore usable by the unassisted independent handicapped person) is at the northeast entrance of the building. This means that the handicapped person must roll his wheelchair for

a distance of three city blocks. This is obviously too long a distance for the unassisted crippled. Furthermore, the northeast door is not open in the evenings.

There are several things which can be done to make easier the lot of the handicapped employees and scholars who make use of the Library. The following suggestions do not require the expenditure of appropriated funds; in fact, they require only an interest, an awareness, and a sensitivity to the problem.

(1) There should be some sort of Library-wide awareness program to acquaint all Library employees who must deal with the public with the Library's policy of providing assistance for the handicapped. This is really a form of "sensitivity training" which is badly needed. I am informed by Mr. Howard Blancher of your Administrative Department that at present there are no regulations or instructions given the Library guards concerning the parking needs of the handicapped, and that, in fact, the Library guards have received no instructions whatever concerning so simple a matter as allowing the handicapped the time necessary to even get in and out of their cars and assisting them or their drivers in parking reasonably close to the building.

(2) A Library-wide review is needed by someone aware of the needs of the handicapped to point out the modest and rational means by which ramp placement, parking arrangements, and door schedules may be altered for the convenience of the handicapped.

(3) Guards at the east parking lot should be instructed to grant permission—perhaps after telephone request, as at the Smithsonian—to allow the severely handicapped to park in the lot, leaving their keys in the car so that it may be moved if necessary. There should be a small cut made in the 12-inch high granite edging which separates the east parking lot from the northeast entrance so that those in wheelchairs or with difficulty in walking would not have to proceed the 150 yards now required to circumvent this stone edging. The northeast entrance, at present the only adequately ramped entrance to the Library (and this includes the Jefferson Building), should be open whenever the Library itself is open.

The National Gallery and the Kennedy Center recently have undertaken an awareness program such as the one I have described. Their programs have been remarkably successful. I know that the Library of Congress, so important to tourists and scholars, will wish to do the same.

At your convenience, may I have a report from you on what steps are being undertaken to make the Library accessible to all Americans and not just the temporarily able-bodied.

Sincerely,

H. G. GALLAGHER.

JUNE 2, 1977.

DR. DANIEL J. BOORSTIN,
The Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress,
10 First Street, SE., Washington,
D.C.

DEAR DR. BOORSTIN: I look forward to having your report and reply to my letter of May 12 concerning facilities for the use of the handicapped at the Library of Congress. Enclosed your will find a copy of a theater program for the Kennedy Center. You will note the paragraph which outlines Kennedy Center provisions for the handicapped. The Center allows cars with license plates bearing the wheelchair symbol to park without notification opposite the entrance. Any car bearing a handicapped person may park in the basement lot after prior notice is given by telephone.

Several years ago while I was at work on my book on Senate policy the Librarian allowed me to make use of the east lot, pro-

viding only that I leave the keys to my car with the guard on duty so that the car could be moved as required. Perhaps some such provision could be worked out for the general use of the functional independent handicapped after prior notification by telephone. Whatever parking arrangements are made, it seems to me to be most important that the guards on duty are made aware of the arrangements, and that printed notification is suitably displayed and distributed so that handicapped persons resident in the area and visitors will be made aware of the available facilities.

The present arrangement is not working at all. It is generous of you to allow the use of your own parking place in the evenings and on weekends by the handicapped. Unfortunately, the guards on duty are not aware that this space is available. I have yet to find a guard who will allow me to make use of it—and I have tried repeatedly. Also, I have been told there is a portable sign reserving a spot for the use of the handicapped, but I have yet to see it.

Sincerely,

H. G. GALLAGHER.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1977.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: Your letter of May 12, 1977 regarding Library of Congress accessibility for the handicapped has been referred to me for attention.

First, please accept my apologies for your experience with our Special Police. Instructions are on the books as to proper and courteous service and assistance. These instructions have now been reemphasized strongly and I trust that there will be no recurrence of your previous experience.

Although I am very sorry that it was necessary for you to write once again concerning the problems which limit accessibility of the Library's facilities to handicapped persons, I do appreciate your advising us of the difficulties you encounter so that we may take appropriate remedial steps. With reference to your suggestions and comments, I can report that the following actions have now been taken to make the Library buildings and grounds more accessible to the handicapped.

Three parking spaces have been reserved evenings (after 5 p.m.) and weekends and holidays for handicapped people in the Library's northeast quadrant parking facility. Signs are being made to so indicate. These spaces are convenient to the northeast entrance to the Library of Congress Building. A ramp leading to this doorway is presently provided. Arrangements have been made with the Office of the Architect to make necessary curb cuts between this parking facility and the sidewalk leading to the entrance ramp. The northeast entrance to the Library of Congress Building will be kept open hereafter during the hours the building is open to the public. A Special Policeman will be stationed at this entrance to assist visitors, to handle emergencies, and to provide for other essential entrance control requirements.

As you know an architectural consulting firm engaged by the Architect of the Capitol has recently conducted a survey of existing conditions on our buildings and grounds and has submitted comprehensive recommendations for providing facilities for the physically handicapped. The report which resulted from this survey provides a basis for the development of a barrier free environment. We expect that there will be further improvements as a consequence.

The question of the front door ramp, I am told, is complicated by the fact that its pitch can only be improved by extending the ramp further, and this is impossible without bringing the ramp directly and dangerously into the footpath. The ramp is used primarily to move heavy items in and out of

the Library. A sign will be prepared to indicate this.

Please be assured of our interest in improving Library accessibility and usefulness and again, please accept my sincere personal apologies for any discourtesies that you may have experienced from Library of Congress staff members.

Sincerely yours,

EDMOND L. APPLEBAUM, Director.

DR. VINCENT V. LA BRUNA MADE
KNIGHT COMMANDER OF THE
SOVEREIGN ORDER OF CYPRUS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present to this distinguished representative body, highlights of a ceremony conferring distinction upon one of New York State's foremost doctors of dental surgery, Vincent V. La Bruna.

The ceremony was celebrated recently in the Ecumenical Chapel of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, New York City. In the presence of a number of distinguished prelates and public officials, Dr. La Bruna was invested as a knight commander of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus.

The American branch of this pre-eminent order, only 49 members strong, is chartered by the State of New York, in which its purpose is stated as follows:

To strive for the maintenance of Christian ideals and Western Humanism, the liberty and dignity of Man, and to oppose all forms of oppression.

I take great pride in having been invested as a Knight Commander myself this year.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus, one of the four oldest orders of chivalry, was founded in the year 1192 by Guy de Lusignan, King of Cyprus and Jerusalem, and confirmed by his Holiness in the year 1200, investing the order with the dual apostolate of spreading the Christian faith, and serving as the bulwark of Christendom in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Modelled after the Hospitaller and military orders of the Temple and of St. John, as established in the Holy Land, it paved the way for subsequent foundations and other orders such as the Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem Byzantine which continues to serve mankind to this very day.

The first investiture of the order took place on the Island of Cyprus where Guy de Lusignan received 300 noblemen into the order and awarded them the red, eight pointed crusader's cross, and commissioned them to defend the island route to the Holy Land, and ward off the attacks and infiltration attempts of the infidels.

From the very outset, the order comprised of men-at-arms, chaplains, and serving brothers, who with the knights, were organized into commanderies. Members were distinguished by the blue mantle with the red cross of the order.

The order attracted to its ranks some of the most vigorous nobles of Christen-

dom. These knights shared a very noteworthy historical, cultural, and spiritual patrimony. They took an active interest in the affairs of the Holy Roman and Byzantine Empires, in addition to their defense of pilgrims and their charitable works.

Under a succession of able grand masters for more than three centuries, the deeds and influence of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus were enormous, and its members played an important role in the stabilization of the cultural and political life of the ages it shared.

Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that through the centuries, totalitarian and atheistic states have been openly hostile to traditional chivalry, by either trying to destroy it, or to reorient it. However, a soul cannot be destroyed, nor can an ideal founded essentially upon principles of love and charity be nullified.

It may be asked why such an ancient organization, with presumably superficial thoughts and out of touch with the present, is called upon by those who live today. It is for one reason, and one reason alone. The perennial nature of the order reflects its profound and stimulating ideals. Indeed, its tradition serves as a basis for reasonable and valid action allowing the order to remain the ideal representation, the "city" if you will, of all hope.

About us we witness the attacks and decay of what is dearest for us to preserve. Materialism dehumanizes and de-personifies man, similar to a cancer. The hatred of God hides under dry rationalism, and fundamental intolerances are masked under hypocritical words of appeasement.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus undertakes as its task, to defend the values of our Western civilization, a dedication which involves courage and self-sacrifice. The order singles out, and invites to membership, men of science who are still sensible, artists whose works can serve as examples for others, thinkers who are not afraid to defend the values of Western humanism, and those who strive for a better world for us to enjoy. It honors leaders of the free world from all walks of life, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

As a modern organization, the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, based on ancient principles and traditions, is dedicated to the building of schools, hospitals, churches, and other charitable, spiritual, and educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, these are the essential components covering the ideals and objectives of the order to which Dr. Vincent La Bruna has been received.

The American branch of this order is headed by His Excellency the Most Reverend Lorenzo Michel de Valitch, grand chancellor and heir to the rich traditions of this ancient order, who is also the General Apostolic Administrator of the Ecumenical World Patriarchate, an apostolic church, dedicated to the reunion of all Christians, under modern principles.

The magistral seat of the order is in Rome, Italy, and enables the U.S. commandery to enjoy certain diplomatic privileges for the purpose of propagating the order as a subject of international

law in those countries where it functions. The order also enjoys the right of active and passive diplomatic representation, and the right to guarantee and direct such representation in each and every place where its credentials have been presented. It may appoint ambassadors, ministers, and consular representatives with specific districts, and accordingly issue appropriate diplomatic credentials pursuant to international custom.

To our fellow New Yorker, Dr. La Bruna, and the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, our congratulations, and best wishes in your work.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like at this time to congratulate all the outstanding members of this order, in these United States and abroad, reaching as it does into all walks of life, and following those principles which we all hold dear, and reaffirming continuity of Christian effort against terror and injustice. Members are such dignitaries as sovereigns, heads of state, princes of the church, and numerous princes, scientists, educators, artists, industrialists, and leaders of the free world of every race, color, creed, and national origin. In closing may I commend His Excellency The Most Reverend Archbishop Lorenzo Michel de Valitch, for his humanitarian efforts, and wish him and the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, of which he is grand chancellor, sustained success in their worthwhile endeavor.

JOHN RATHBUN YOUNG TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to bring to the attention of the body that July 18 is the birthday of John Rathbun Young of Newport Beach, Calif.

A big man of warm heart and intense pride in his home State of California, Mr. Young has often been referred to with the same name as that animal which represents the State of California, the bear.

John R. Young on the 18th of July will be 44 years old having been born in 1933 in Illinois and moving to California in that year.

Each year a group of prominent Newport Beach citizens gather to pay tribute to John R. Young on the occasion of his birthday. This fine warm person, usually in honor of his own birthday, engages in acts of charity and contribution to society in remembrance of his birthday, and it is largely because of this and his previous success in business as a partner/owner of Young and Lane Tire Co., that causes friends to fete his birthday with frolic and festivity including from time to time helicopter messages of congratulations towed across the skies.

It is because of his contributions to his community and society that I honor Mr. Young on his 44th birthday and bring this to the attention of my col-

leagues so that they might join me in congratulating Mr. Young of Newport Beach.

U.S. POLICY ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, there can never be real peace in the world until there is a reduction of tensions in the Middle East. So long as these tensions exist, the threat of world conflict likewise exists. Peace in the Middle East will eliminate a major threat to world peace and will also make it possible for Israel and her Arab neighbors to devote their energies and resources to their own peaceful national purposes.

Central to the United States Middle East policy must be a firm commitment to the independence and security of the State of Israel. We must continue to provide Israel with diplomatic support and sufficient military and economic assistance so that it can remain strong and able to defend itself at all times.

In 1948, our country was one of the first to recognize the independence of the State of Israel. At that time, we were inspired by the perseverance of those who had labored so hard and so long for the establishment of a Jewish homeland. We remembered Dachau and the other horror camps. Israel was committed to the same moral concepts and principles of democracy, justice, and freedom to which we adhered and shared our values in the Judeo-Christian heritage.

Since that time, Israel has emerged as an open and democratic society and should be applauded for its impressive political and economic development and for its incredible ability to defend itself against overwhelming odds.

Israel is a valuable ally for the United States. It is a barrier against Soviet expansion into the vital Middle East area. It offers protection on the fringe of NATO. Providing military aid for Israel is in our national interest. We receive excellent value for this expenditure. In Congress, I will vote for the funds required to insure that Israel always has the weapons to defend itself.

In dealing with the complexities of the Middle East, we must be realistic and pragmatic. We must not permit an arms race to develop. Our country should not provide sophisticated arms to the Arab States, including Egypt. The aid which we provide to them should be limited to economic assistance.

Direct negotiations between Israel and her neighbors are essential to the resolution of tensions in the Middle East. Peace cannot be imposed from without. It must develop from within. Direct negotiations between Israel and the Arabs is the only way to achieve secure and defensible borders. And the Arabs will never negotiate seriously with Israel if they believe that they can defeat Israel militarily, erode her economically, or isolate her politically.

The Suez Canal should be opened to free passage of shipping of all nations, including Israel.

Our representatives in the United Nations must continue to work against efforts to separate Israel from the family of nations and they must vigorously oppose all efforts to discriminate against Israel in the world community.

Similarly, our Government must oppose with more effective legislation and more vigorous action the Arab boycott against Israel. The Arab boycott of Israeli goods is bad enough, but there is little we can do about it. However, when Arab countries extend that boycott to include countries and firms that deal with Israel, we can and should react. I am referring, of course, to the secondary and tertiary boycotts employed by the Arabs.

In the Maryland State Senate, I sponsored the Foreign Discriminatory Boycotts Act. The purpose behind this legislation was to purge from all commercial transactions occurring in Maryland the foreign imposition of terms and conditions which discriminate against our citizens because of their national origin, race, or religion.

In Congress, I voted for legislation that will make it illegal for American firms to knowingly comply with the secondary or tertiary Arab boycotts. Legislation of this kind should be worded as strongly as possible to effectively kill this insidious and vicious form of economic warfare.

As a member of the Select Energy Committee, I also intend to take an active role in encouraging national programs designed to conserve energy and to create viable new energy sources. We must strive for American self-sufficiency in the long run so as to eliminate the danger of Arab oil blackmail.

Israel has demonstrated that international terrorism can be defeated. But there is a simpler way. Our Government should strive to obtain an international agreement denying landing rights to the airlines of those nations who provide a haven for terrorists. I am a sponsor of a House Resolution that attempts to secure international cooperation in combating terrorism. The release of Arab terrorist Abu Daoud by the French, which I protested on the floor of the House, should never happen again since it only served to encourage those in the world who rely on terrorism as a means to attract attention to their political views. Only when terrorists know that they have no sanctuaries will terrorism disappear.

I am also very concerned about the welfare and treatment of non-Israeli Jews living in the Middle East, specifically Syria. I have written President Carter urging that he bring the issue of Syrian Jewry before President Assad of Syria.

U.S. CITIZENRY NEEDS TO BE PREPARED FOR SURVIVAL

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the debate over American preparedness for a

nuclear confrontation has grown into a national controversy. Newspaper headlines tell the story of concern over the effectiveness and costs of such items as the cruise missile and the B-1 bomber. These stories, however, only touch on the extent and complexity of this growing debate.

One issue which I feel has not been adequately addressed during these heated discussions is civilian preparedness for a national emergency of nuclear-war magnitude. We are debating the readiness of our military and are sadly neglecting the ability of our friends and neighbors to prepare for such an emergency.

The International Relations Committee, of which I am a member, often hears of the intense efforts of other countries to prepare for a nuclear confrontation. To balance out the picture, I am anxious for my colleagues to read an analysis of America's current civil defense capabilities. It is a frightening counterpart to any report on other countries' efforts.

I hope each Member finds this report, prepared by John Bex, director of region 2 of the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, as informative and unsettling as I have. We must face up to our current civil defense capabilities and take steps to reverse the trend toward indecision and inaction.

I include the region 2 Civil Defense position paper to be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CIVIL DEFENSE POSITION PAPER

The purpose of this paper is to provide an assessment of the mismanagement and neglect which has existed in the Federal Government in preparing the United States citizenry for survival and recovery under national and local emergency conditions and to propose a different direction.

CAUSES

An inadequate and ineffectual civil defense policy

We are lacking a basic national policy and direction which would provide for survival of the nation and which would serve to guide the efforts of all federal agencies involved and provide a model for state and local governments to follow.

Proliferation of authority and responsibility

The House Armed Services Committee Report No. 94-39 states that, "It is apparent . . . that civil defense, or emergency preparedness in a broader concept, has no settled place in the Federal Government." The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, authorizes a system of civil defense for the protection of life and property from an attack. To administer this act there has been a succession of agencies—FCDA, OCD, ODCM, OCD and now DCPA—which have been established to take certain actions in preparation for an attack situation.

The National Security Act of 1947, as amended, the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended and related Executive Orders causes the General Services Administration, Federal Preparedness Agency (GSA/FPA) to be responsible for Federal Agency coordination, policy guidance and planning related to attack and recovery.

The Disaster Relief Act of 1974 and related Executive Orders causes the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration (FDAA) to be responsible for administering and coordinating certain planning and relief programs related to natural disaster situations.

In all there are 11 Federal Departments and 28 or more Federal Agencies that have emer-

gency preparedness assignments involving national preparedness and our ability to survive.

Leadership in the Executive

Not since May 25, 1961, President Kennedy's Civil Defense message to Congress, has a Chief Executive publicly addressed the need for civil defense. Civil Defense is a part of our total strategic deterrent posture. It is a primary element for national survival. But the need for survival planning and its acceptance as an essential way of life in the nuclear age have not been articulated convincingly to the public from the executive level.

EFFECTS

1. Lack of national purpose and direction has resulted in little more than a holding action on United States civil defense. The defense part of the offense/defense equation has been continuously deemphasized. The civil defense part of the defense posture has suffered out of proportion to all other elements. Of the \$114.9 billion projected for FY 77 National Defense Budget, only \$82.5 million (.07%) of the National Defense Budget was set aside for civil defense.

2. The lack of national priority, unified management and supervisory controls has resulted in duplication of effort, disparity in actions, waste of money, and inefficient accomplishment of the nation's emergency needs. Confusion due to the splintered federal effort is reflected at State and local government levels. These jurisdictions find it extremely difficult to ascertain which federal agencies are doing what and for whom. In recent hearings on Civil Preparedness and Limited Nuclear War, before the Joint Committee on Defense Preparedness, General Otto Nilson, Jr. (Retired) stated that "... numerous governmental agencies . . . have . . . an emergency or crisis role as an extension of their everyday duties and responsibilities. What is needed is for this to be spelled out and organizational means developed to assure that this is done, that the work is monitored to assess performance, and that the pieces are put together on the basis of some workable coordination effort."

3. Apathy at State and local levels reflects the lack of Federal resolution and purpose on a national scale. The defense of the country and the protection of the people are elements of the common defense as provided for under the Constitution and are primarily a federal responsibility. The general public reacts to a national situation in the way in which their leaders react. Apathy and indifference at the federal level cascades and permeates all political levels making the prospect of providing adequately for the common defense an insurmountable task. Cuts in the federal budget for civil defense are echoed in the budgets of State and local governments. The result is widespread atrophy. For example, there is erosion in the National Shelter System, Radiological Defense System and Emergency Public Information System. At the same time, we are only able to effectively warn about 47% of the national population and have a "minimum" nuclear disaster operational capability for about 36% of the national population.

4. Avoidance of the issues by recent Chief Executives has left the public confused, uncertain, fatalistic and virtually uninformed as to the value of civil defense as an instrument of national survival. The result is a weakness in our national will to sustain crises, and survive attack, inviting coercion or blackmail in our strategic posture. Former Secretary of State Kissinger said that "A thermonuclear war which broke over a psychologically unprepared population might lead to a loss of faith in society and government."

What needs to be done

1. The Congress and Executive should undertake coordinate action to establish and

promulgate a policy of emergency preparedness and survival. This policy should cover the complete spectrum of emergency preparedness from local natural and accidental disasters to that of a nuclear attack upon the country, since there is a large element of commonality in the systems and services which are involved in such situations.

2. Emergency preparedness functions and services presently under the 3 agencies (DCPA, GSA/FPA and FDAA) should be combined into a single agency to provide for management control and operational efficiency. This agency should be placed in the Department of Defense (at the Secretary of Service level) so that a balanced effort between offensive and defensive priorities can be achieved. Primary responsibilities would be vested in the Department of Defense with other Federal departments and agencies providing directed support.

3. In order for civil preparedness to be successful, the Secretary of the new agency must be a strong leader who is dedicated and firmly committed to the survival mission. He must have the confidence of the President and Secretary of Defense, must be experienced in effecting rapport with the Congressional, State and local leadership. He must be unencumbered in his personal commitment to a viable civil preparedness and readiness posture. This position requires a creative manager dedicated to change.

4. Adequate funding support is required for Civil Preparedness and national emergency support functions to assure a viable program which can develop into a significant element of national strategic defense and provide civilian protection from the effects of a national calamity.

5. While we cannot keep the American populace continuously mobilized for war, we must keep the people informed and do a better job of educating them to the kind of austerity and commitment that they would be called to undertake in a nuclear emergency.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS

HON. JAMES A. S. LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, election abuses have shaken public confidence in the integrity of our political system and have accentuated the need for tightening Federal election laws. Accordingly, I have today introduced H.R. 8092, the Congressional Election Finance Reform Act of 1977 establishing a procedure for limited Federal financing of congressional campaigns.

Federal financing of the Presidential election functioned reasonably well last year. However, large group contributions, substantially barred from the Presidential campaign, were in turn concentrated on congressional election races. In fact, a Common Cause survey shows that over \$22 million was expended on congressional campaigns in 1976, an amount double that spent in 1974.

Interestingly the vast majority of this money went to one definable group; namely, incumbents. Fred Wertheimer of Common Cause has described the situation succinctly. He has noted:

In Congress today, we have neither a Democratic nor a Republican Party. Rather we have an incumbency party which operates a monopoly.

Monopolies in the political arena apparently can only be broken up by the exercise of countervailing monopoly power or by placing restrictions on the exercise of that power.

With these thoughts in mind, I would like to briefly outline several differences in approach between the Anderson-Udall bill and the public financing bill I have introduced. First, my bill applies to primary as well as general elections. The matching fund provisions come into play once \$10,000 is raised in contributions under \$250 and once an opponent raises \$10,000 in any size amounts. In House races where no incumbent is involved, the maximum Federal matching contribution is \$50,000 and in Senate races it is \$100,000, except in larger States where by a formula related to the voting population the amount may be higher. In races involving an incumbent, the challenger(s) in either a primary or general election is entitled to a 50 percent greater Federal matching contribution—that is, \$1.50 for each eligible \$1 raised privately.

In addition, my bill restricts contributions to individual residents within a given electoral district and limits these individual contributions to \$500 in any election cycle. Emphasis is placed where I feel it should be—that is, on small, individual contributions from within a congressional district or State. We do not have representative democracy when we allow citizens from outside a State or congressional district to contribute to campaigns in other districts and regions of the country.

Effectively speaking, out-of-State contributions give a significant policy voice to people who have no ties with the State from which an individual Congressman or Senator is elected. An elected official who receives outside support owes a certain allegiance to concerns which may not be identical with those of the constituents who actually voted in his election. I would like to be clear that I am not speaking about an unrealistic, theoretical issue. In my home State of Iowa, a State primarily of rural and small town concerns, we have had a number of recent elections where the winning candidates have received the majority of their financial support from outside the State and this support was not just of an "equalizing nature" but allowed these candidates to outspend their opponents approximately 2 to 1. This is wrong and in my judgment is one reason why increasingly the voting records of elected officials do not philosophically reflect the people who elect them.

It is no accident that we have a Congress of the United States indebted to either big business or big labor, a Congress where the small businessman, the farmer, the worker and ordinary citizen are only secondarily represented. Hence also, it is no accident that the middle class bears a heavier tax burden than the rich; that small companies lack the tax advantages of the integrated oil companies; and that inflation is the economic issue of the day. I would like to stress this last point; inflation is not unrelated to campaign financing abuses.

The roots of inflation begin in Federal

spending and Federal spending begins in promises and obligations, and all this begins with politicians. It begins, in fact, in the way campaigns are run. It begins in politics as usual, in commitments to large contributors, no matter who they are. The most effective way for a candidate to achieve support in a bid for legislative office is to isolate every identifiable group—especially moneyed groups—and announce support for the group's vested interest. Unfortunately, going along with the most powerful interest groups inevitably leads either to the proliferation of Federal programs or to the weakening of the tax structure. Fiscal balance and equitability are impossible to maintain after lawmakers, that is, the successful candidates, have committed themselves in advance to support specific tax advantages or Government programs favoring those having made generous campaign contributions. America may be a society of individuals, but power groupings—not individuals—are represented in legislative bodies where money is a key determinant of election outcome.

In addition to the out-of-State and out-of-district limitation, my bill prohibits group contributions of any nature. It is simply a fact of life that when big money in the form of group contributions enters the political arena, big obligations are entertained. Groups seldom reflect the same collective judgment as all their members. More importantly, decisions for organizations frequently occur at the top not the bottom and the abdication of local control over funds leads to the aggrandizement of leadership power within organizations and thus within any Government channel where the organization's impact is felt. Individuals who control other peoples' money become power brokers in an elitist society. Their views, not the small contributors to their association, become the views that carry influence.

Clearly there also is need for full disclosure of all campaign contributions, monetary or in kind. Currently loopholes exist in Federal campaign reporting laws which allow candidates to refuse to itemize certain donations and to accept a large numbers of gifts at the end of a campaign so the public does not know the sources of campaign funds until after the election. It seems to me that the only way to deal with this problem is to require that all contributions of any size whatsoever be disclosed by name, amount, date, and place of residents, and that those over \$100 include the occupation and the principal place of business. Sometimes it is claimed that such disclosure is an impossible thing to put into place. While I admit that this is not altogether easy, it can reasonably be done and, in fact, we did so during the two campaigns in which I was a candidate. Parenthetically, I might add that in my two campaigns for Congress we also placed restrictions against all out-of-State and group contributions and it would be my judgment that the placement of these limitations gave impetus to increased individual campaign participation, in terms of volunteer activity as well as campaign giving.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate my support for limited public campaign financing. A Government of the people, by the people and for the people cannot be a Government where influence is purchasable through large, private campaign contributions. The subordination of individual rights to indiscriminate moneyed influence is the subordination of representative democracy to institutional oligarchy.

I recognize that limiting campaign contributions to constituents of candidates places certain restrictions on non-constituents which may be considered to infringe first amendment rights. However, I believe an argument on first amendment grounds against placing such a restriction misconceives the nature of a campaign contribution. A campaign contribution, in my judgment, should be conceptualized as part of the "narrowing process" identified by the Supreme Court. As such, it is proper—indeed it may even be required—that the process be limited to constituents.

Just as a party nomination is in fact, but not in law, necessary to election, so too adequate campaign finances are essential. This makes the individual who signs a nominating petition or votes in a primary election analogous to the individual who contributes money. And just as those who sign petitions and vote in primaries must be constituents, so ought those who contribute.

Admittedly this requires a reorientation of the traditional conceptualization of the campaign financing process. Over the years we have recognized the electoral process as including more and more activities. This is a conceptual change which is long overdue if our elections are to produce representatives who reflect the constituents of their district.

It can also be argued that exclusion of group contributions entails an unconstitutional abridgment of the freedom of individuals to associate in groups for political purposes.

First let it be noted that in the approach I advocate group political activity per se is not excluded. A wide range of organizational activity is still open: groups may communicate with their members, may organize voter registration drives and may politic in the community. They are only precluded from giving direct contributions to the campaign committee of a candidate.

Based on the abuses we have witnessed in the past, I believe this restriction is quite reasonable. The balance we must strike in legislating proper restrictions on campaign giving is between the marginal value of group contributions to individual candidates, given the opportunities for both individual contributions to the campaign and group activities in direct communication, and the possibility that enormous conflicts of interest may arise from the acceptance of such contributions.

In my judgment, Congress is justified in concluding that the threat of improper activities is of such a magnitude as to override the marginal value of such contributions and that the integrity of the electoral process cannot be upheld absent a ban on group contributions.

OPPOSED TO CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the congressional pay raise. I am in support of the Federal executive pay raise. But the manner in which these two distinct issues were brought to the floor today—as a package with one tied to the other—did not allow me the opportunity to vote on these two items as separate items.

I think that today's vote is one more argument in support of separating congressional pay matters from Civil Service pay matters.

In my 6 months as a Member of Congress, I have spoken against the congressional pay raise at every opportunity. I have pointed out to my constituents that I do not believe that Congressmen need a pay increase, nor is this the proper time to adopt a 28-percent increase. In private industry, managers know whether or not they are offering a sufficient salary for vacant positions by the number of applicants for those positions. Applying that standard to congressional "jobs," I think that the salary is sufficient in light of the fact that there were 22 "applicants" for the seat I now hold. I have voted against the congressional pay increase at every opportunity—until today when I was forced to join the 2-to-1 Democratic majority—and the other Members representing suburban Maryland and Virginia—in voting in favor of H.R. 7932.

I had voted for this bill because I support a pay raise for Federal executive employees and had indicated to my constituents that I would support them even if it meant that I had to vote for a congressional pay increase. Many of the top-level civil servants affected by today's vote live in my congressional district. Over 7,100 of them live in the Washington metropolitan area. It may be popular to denigrate the workings of the Federal bureaucracy and to portray Federal workers as lazy, dim-witted paper pushers and regulation writers. But I think that we all know that this portrait is neither accurate nor fair.

I support a pay raise for the top-level bureaucrats—those who have heavy responsibilities and many of whom have advanced degrees and vast experience in their fields—because they have not had a single pay increase in 8 years and have only received one cost-of-living increase—which was only 5 percent. During this same 8-year period, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 60 percent and private industry wages have increased by 70 percent. No matter how we look at it, the situation is totally intolerable. From a Government efficiency standpoint, the situation is almost criminally negligent, for many of these highly qualified individuals have had to quit Government work because they could not keep up with the cost of living and were offered more financially rewarding posi-

tions in private industry. We have lost experience and expertise because of the shortsighted policy of capping Federal wages. The only good thing about today's vote on H.R. 7932 is that this situation has at long last been rectified.

It is unfortunate that the Democratic leadership has refused to allow these two issues—congressional salaries and civil service salaries—to be considered individually on their merits. The rule for consideration of this bill—which I voted against—required that these issues be considered jointly. Once again voters are denied the opportunity to see how their Member of Congress would have voted on the congressional pay raise had it been considered as a separate item of business. And adoption of this rule also denied me the opportunity to cast my vote once more against the congressional increase.

NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing H.R. 7871—the Stocks Management and Reserve Act of 1977. This bill provides for a farmer owned and held national food reserve of 25 to 35 million metric tons. This reserve system will remove grain from the market in periods of oversupply and return grain to the market whenever serious production setbacks occur. H.R. 7871 also adopts that provision of the Senate farm bill which establishes an "International Emergency Food Reserve" of 2 million metric tons to be used for foreign disaster and famine relief.

I would also like to submit for the RECORD letters of endorsement of H.R. 7871 by three prominent national consumer organizations. As all informed consumers acknowledge, their interests are integrally linked to those of the farm community, and the attached statements reveal a clear understanding of these joint interests:

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., June 23, 1977.

HON. JAMES WEAVER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEAVER: After examining the provisions in H.R. 7871 we wish to express our support for this national farmer held grain reserve.

With the present inordinately large carry-over of grain stocks and this history of boom and bust agriculture, it is not only essential, but an ideal time to establish a reserve system which will protect both the producer and the consumer from the subsequent extreme price fluctuations. Our concerns with giving farmers a fair return for their labor and protecting both consumers and farmers from inflationary conditions presently rampant are all met in this reserve plan.

We thank you for addressing this issue and will be watching eagerly for a favorable outcome.

Sincerely,
KATHLEEN-F. O'REILLY,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,
June 24, 1977.

Hon. JAMES WEAVER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WEAVER: As you are aware, we recognize the urgent need for a workable national grain reserve system. It is our feeling that the "Stocks management and Reserve Act of 1977" (H.R. 7871) adequately meets this need. The provision for release prices provides a shelter for the consumer from the high prices of low production years, and gives support to the farmer in years of overproduction as we have presently.

We offer our enthusiastic support of this bill and hope that it will be met with equal enthusiasm by your colleagues.

Sincerely,

FRANCES A. ZWENIG.

COMMUNITY NUTRITION INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1977.

Hon. JAMES WEAVER,
1238 Longworth Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEAVER: Thank you very much for sending us the copy of H.R. 7871 for our comment. As you know, we are interested in the issue of reserves for several reasons, especially as they influence food prices.

We have carefully examined the "Stocks Management and Reserve Act of 1977" (H.R. 7871), and it is a good method for handling food reserves. We hope you and the other members of Congress who have joined in this effort are successful in getting this proposal adopted. We are available to assist you in any way we may.

In most American homes, the cost of food is the largest single item in the family budget. Over the last eight years, rising food prices have been a major source of concern, and have caused many families to reduce expenditures for other family needs or to change diet patterns and increase the health risks for children and parents.

The price pattern since 1970 is clear, inexorable and painfully obvious. Price increases for raw commodities are quickly passed on by processors, but price decreases rarely have the same effect. While wheat prices have dropped by nearly 50 percent, the price of bread has not decreased. We are told that a decline in commodity prices makes it possible for the middleman to absorb increased costs elsewhere, but all the family knows is that the cost of food goes up and does not come down.

This means the system works for everyone except the consumer, and the less the income the more painful is the experience. It is doubtful that increased food costs can be avoided altogether, but we should be able to do better than we have in the past.

One way to moderate price fluctuations, and ease the rachet effect of higher prices, is to create a system of basic food reserves. A food reserve system is simple to understand because it operates on an ancient and simple principle. Food reserves are accumulated during periods of surplus when farm prices are low, held off the market when supplies are normal, and used when food shortages occur. Food reserves help to support farm income when it is low, and to keep food available at reasonable cost when crops are poor.

Sincerely,

RODNEY E. LEONARD,
Executive Director.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals was held here in Washington. Over 2,500 persons—the handicapped, parents of the handicapped, and professionals working with them—came together to discuss the problems of the 28 million Americans whose disabilities exclude them from full participation in our society. While this Conference was a laudable effort to focus attention on the problems of these citizens who have more often been the recipients of pity and rhetoric, than of meaningful attempts to understand their problems and to integrate them into the mainstream of American life, I regret that reports reaching me indicate otherwise.

Apparently, despite the dedicated labors of many fine people, the handicapped have once again been denied the opportunity to be heard by the government and to speak for themselves. Perhaps the planners of the Conference themselves fell victim to the age-old myths about the incompetence of the handicapped and lacked confidence or faith in the ability of the disabled to know their own needs and arrive at a consensus about what should be done to meet them. This consensus was the intent of Congress, as expressed in title III of Public Law 93-516, but it did not happen, and through no fault of the handicapped.

From the beginning, the Conference seemed to lose track of its central mission. I understand that its executive director stated, on more than one occasion, his belief that the handicapped were not yet able to advise us concerning their needs and priorities for the future. Thus the Conference was billed as "educational." According to representatives of the handicapped, the keystone of this Conference has been "custody and care" rather than "democratic self-expression and contribution."

What it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is that many delegates feel they were brought to Washington to put a rubber stamp on conclusions already reached by the Conference staff. They feel that they were coddled and cared for in a way that, far from aiding their cause with the Government and the public, contributes to the already-held false notion that the handicapped are incapable of independence and participation in daily life.

The State-level conferences which were held to select issues and delegates to the national conference showed these same negative attitudes. The selection of delegates was made almost entirely discretionary, and the result was a heavy preponderance of professional providers of services to the disabled, who have a strong vested interest in the status quo.

When the delegates arrived in Washington, they found little chance for open discussion and fresh input. They were assigned to workshops with predetermined agendas. More than 3,500 issues were to be discussed, with 2-minute time limits on each speaker. The decision-making process was a computerized "prioritizing" of the 3,500 issues. Quite understandably, hundreds of the delegates objected to this, arguing for the more conventional and open democratic debating and voting process typical of large conferences and the Congress itself.

The discontent with the preplanned structure was so widespread that the Conference planners were forced to hold a plenary session where resolutions could be presented by delegates and voted on. But the shift in approach came too late for any meaningful decisionmaking to occur.

As I have mentioned, the arrangements for handling the delegates have also received criticism from the handicapped. A private consulting firm was hired to organize the Conference and to channel the hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars spent on these special arrangements. The travel schedule of each delegate was established by the Conference, and upon arrival in Washington, they were watched over and herded at every point. Even the delegates' meals were planned for them, with no choice as to restaurant or type of food. The result, many handicapped delegates felt, has been to further ingrain in the public mind an image of the disabled as requiring all of this special treatment and constant care—an image incompatible with their independence and capacity to carry on employment or normal living.

Beyond this, a number of the arrangements undertaken by the Conference staff are so far from normal Federal conference procedures and so favorable to a few private firms, that I am asking the General Accounting Office to investigate the Conference. An example is the meal plan I just mentioned. It took the protest of several State Governors to relax the requirement for eating all meals at the Conference hotel. Even so, under the White House Conference plan, the hotel received \$28 per day for meals, while the delegates who resisted the Conference meal plan were reimbursed only \$16 per day for their meals away from the hotel.

I am also asking the General Accounting Office to investigate the justification for the Conference's use of a private firm to handle logistics and travel arrangements when a large staff of Federal employees had already been assigned. I find it disconcerting that rather than being allowed to make their arrangements independently, all travel arrangements were made by the Conference logistics contractor.

However, Mr. Speaker, not all of the results of this Conference have been negative. In fact, one result has been very positive, and it is an indication that there is real movement in this sector of

the population which has too often been willing to accept custodial treatment. I refer to the fact that a large number of the handicapped delegates resisted the arrangements set up for them, and declared their right to speak for themselves. I am informed that a substantial number of the handicapped—about 400—withdrawn from attendance in the structured Conference sessions in order to discuss and hammer out their own report of issues and concerns. These delegates met on two occasions. They formed a writing committee and discussed and adopted a remarkable document—a concise but comprehensive statement of their needs and their recommendations for change, both legislatively and in terms of society's attitudes. This indicates to me that the handicapped have their own voice and that they know how to use it. Nothing could be a more encouraging sign that their integration into society is likely to come about, for experience with minorities has shown that only when they speak for themselves—not when those with a vested interest in the status quo speak for them—do meaningful change and real progress occur.

I have been privileged to be acquainted with the remarkable progress the blind of this Nation have made in this direction, and I think many of my colleagues share this acquaintance. Since 1940 the blind, organized into the National Federation of the Blind, have been in the forefront of the movement to create for the disabled a voice in their own destiny. The blind were a part of the dissatisfaction with the White House Conference. They have felt among the most damaged by the degrading image of all handicaps spread to the media by the staff of the Conference. But I am happy to say that their philosophy of basic normality and self-determination is now abroad in the whole field, and though there were fewer than 30 members of the federation at the Conference, they were joined by hundreds of other disabled persons representing virtually every other handicap.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, while the consolidating of the spurious computer print-outs and the ballots by mail into a final report is likely to occupy many weeks yet, there is now available for our consideration an alternative report which in every sense is closer to what Congress had in mind when it mandated the Conference. This report speaks concisely, clearly and eloquently to the real concerns of the handicapped citizens of America. It is the result of their free and open discussions and democratic voting, in the best tradition of our country. It should be carefully considered by the Congress and the executive branch as we formulate specific programs to aid this important segment of our citizenry to become an integral and vital part of society. I ask permission to make a summary of this alternative report of the White House Conference a part of the record. I plan to ask that the full report be distributed by the staff of the White House Conference as part of its official and final report to the President and the Congress.

As President Carter said in his speech to the opening session of the Conference, "The time for discrimination against the handicapped is at an end." Let us show our concurrence by joining with the handicapped themselves, not as their keepers, but as their coworkers and supporters, as we move forward in the years ahead to develop meaningful programs for their total integration and independence:

ALTERNATIVE REPORT OF THE HANDICAPPED PERSONS ATTENDING THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

On Wednesday and Thursday, May 25 & 26, at the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, a group of about 400 of the 2500 in attendance at the Conference met to discuss their dissatisfaction with the format of the Conference and to determine if anything could be done. This group was made up of the handicapped themselves, rather than the group gathered for the general Conference which was dominated by providers of services and professionals in the field. The dissatisfied group decided to write an alternative conference report, one which would reflect the direct and pressing needs of the handicapped.

The group—which called itself the Representatives of the Handicapped for an Alternative Conference Report—appointed a writing committee which worked steadily during the 24 hours between the two meetings, and produced a document which was discussed and amended when the group met again on Thursday. Jack Smith, the executive director and architect of the White House Conference, at a Friday (May 27) press conference, stated that the handicapped are "not sophisticated enough about the issues" to do more than be put in contact with each other and be educated. In contradiction to this, a consensus on the Alternative Report was easily reached, and there was no question in the minds of the handicapped persons participating that they did indeed know what they need, and that the only major division in the field is between the handicapped themselves and the professionals with a vested interest in programs as they now exist.

The complete report will be distributed in the next week, but a summary of the positions in it is given below. For copies of the complete report, call (202) 785-2974, or write to National Federation of the Blind, 1346 Connecticut Ave. NW., Suite 212, Washington, D.C. 20036. Kenneth Jernigan, president of the NFB, who was elected chairman of the meetings which produced the report, offered the services of the NFB for this distribution.

SUMMARY OF THE ALTERNATIVE CONFERENCE REPORT

The overriding issue of the report was the need for direct consumer input and consultation in all services for the handicapped. It was declared that at least 50% of all governing and policy-making boards of private and public agencies serving the handicapped should be consumer representatives. It was also declared that the directors and staff of such agencies should be handicapped persons.

The report also stressed that each disability group has unique and specific needs which could only be served by maintaining distinct programs with goals and staff directed to these specific needs. This recommendation condemned the trend toward conglomeration of services for the convenience of bureaucrats, but to the detriment of meaningful services.

In the area of financial support systems, it was noted that the current welfare structure contains strong disincentives for the handicapped to try to become employed. In

many cases employment results in financial loss. It was declared that support programs (particularly medical assistance programs) should be structured so there is no loss of income or medical benefits for becoming employed.

Regarding employment, the recent non-discrimination statutes passed by Congress (sections 501, 503, and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended) were criticized for not requiring goals and timetables for the employment of the handicapped. It was declared that the handicapped should be involved directly in the implementation of these sections, and that the sections should be strengthened to require specific goals.

Civil rights clearly assumed a high priority among the handicapped. It was unanimously felt that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and all other civil rights and affirmative action laws and regulations should be amended to include the handicapped. The handicapped are a minority, just as blacks and women are minorities, and they suffer already from being treated as a class apart. The feeling was that the current legislation aimed at protecting the civil rights of the handicapped was separate from and therefore not equal to legal protections for other minorities.

It was declared that programs for ombudspersons should be established and staffed by the handicapped to monitor all programs for the handicapped.

With regard to Education, it was recommended that alternatives be made available. Mainstreaming (placement of the handicapped in regular classrooms and giving them access to all educational and recreational programs) was supported as a right, but this was seen as meaningless unless full support services were provided to children availing themselves of this right. But the need of some handicapped children for separate programs was also supported as a right. The deaf in particular felt the need for separate and strongly supported residential schools where constant communication for deaf children could occur to develop communication skills and end isolation.

Communication barriers received separate consideration, and it was declared that alternate modes such as sign language and Braille be supported and expanded. The expansion of Right-to-Read programs for cultural minorities was also recommended.

With regard to architectural and transportation barriers, the need for Total Environmental Design rather than merely the removal of barriers was stressed. Full use by the mobility impaired is the goal rather than merely access. Accessibility to all public transportation was recommended, with immediate and strengthened goals. Again, consumer input and monitoring were seen as important elements of this, as well as expanded powers for both federal and local compliance boards.

With regard to mental health and the rights of those termed mentally ill, the total banning of electro-shock therapy and psychosurgery were urged, as well as the banning of the overuse of drug therapy. Institutionalization was seen as a major barrier to successful emotional therapy, and it was recommended that no new mental institutions be constructed, urging instead the setting up and funding of small, community-located, consumer-directed facilities. Also the employment barriers created for those who have been institutionalized or labeled mentally ill were hit hard, and the report criticized the mental health industry as having a stake in certain therapies and practices which are not helpful to patients.

The necessity for changing public attitudes toward the handicapped was emphasized, with all forms of media being urged to present the handicapped realistically rather than as objects of pity. The goal was seen

not to be the liking of all the handicapped, but rather the possibility of their being seen as people with certain characteristics, and being judged on their own merits.

It was unanimously declared that all handicapped persons working in sheltered workshops should be guaranteed the minimum competitive wage mandated for industry, and that workers in these shops be granted the other rights and benefits of workers in open industry.

Other resolutions at the Thursday meeting of the group urged that future White House Conferences address the problems of handicapped women; that pregnancy records be saved by hospitals to aid in the treatment and control of birth defects; and that medicines clearly and understandably warn users of their possible dangers.

QUOTED FROM THE COMPLETE ALTERNATIVE
CONFERENCE REPORT

Background

As the delegates and other participants in the national White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals arrived in Washington, D.C., and learned in more detail of the structure and operation of the Conference, a growing wave of dissatisfaction spread. By Wednesday, May 25th, a sizable number of delegates and participants determined that something must be done for the benefit of the Conference and of all handicapped individuals. A large group (approximately 350) assembled, and its members were generally labeled as "those dissatisfied with the Conference." In large part the reasons for the dissatisfaction were these:

(1) State White House Conferences—

We felt that the state conferences selecting delegates to the national Conference were not structured to allow a truly representative consensus of the needs and wishes of the handicapped. There seemed to be an over-representation of professional service providers. In many (if not most) instances, the delegates were not actually elected at all, but rather, they were chosen by select committees or individuals. This was seen as an undemocratic process.

(2) Issues/Recommendations Structure—

We felt that the approach to developing issues and recommendations was similarly undemocratic. It seemed as though the White House Conference staff had no faith in the basic capacities of handicapped persons to come together to hammer out their own agenda of national priorities. That this should be done by checking boxes and "prioritizing" 3500 separate recommendations (many of which duplicated one another and others of which were unclear in meaning or impact) speaks to this lack of faith. The White House Conference staff claimed that the issues grew out of the state conferences, but even at that level, we were presented with "awareness papers" stating "what we already know," accompanied by long lists of issues which formed the basis of the polling to be done at the state and national conferences. The overly-structured reporting forms for state White House conferences, the delegate workbooks, and computerized voting system for the national conference inhibited the freedom of choice and the ability of the delegates to exercise their best judgment.

(3) Custodial Care of Handicapped Delegates and Participants—

There were several elements in the grand logistics plan for the National White House Conference which were reminiscent of the kind of custodialism that the Conference itself should have been designed to bring to an end. For example, participants in the Conference were pressured into staying in a single hotel and eating all of their meals in the hotel under a meal ticket system. Nor-

mally, delegates to federal conferences are given a per diem amount to provide their own lodging and meals. At first, this arrangement was to be mandatory, but after massive protest, including letters from the governors of several states, delegates were permitted to make other arrangements but not alternates or observers. Even so, those eating away from the hotel were given \$16 per day, while the hotel received \$28 per day per delegate for meals. Delegates were asked to fill out detailed medical forms, and dossiers containing this information were sent to the airlines carrying them to the Conference. Some delegates received airline tickets accompanied by a specimen ticket made out to "John P. Doe", with this labeled, "Your Name." We as representatives of the handicapped feel that such treatment was, in most cases, unnecessary and undesirable and will further damage our image with the general public, and, in doing so, will impede the goals of the White House Conference itself.

THANKS GOVERNMENT FOR HELP

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, all too often, we Members of Congress pass bills authorizing new programs that we send down to the executive agencies to administer. After that, we do not often hear about the program again until its shortcomings or abuses greet us in the morning paper. I want to take just a moment today to do something a little different. I want to share with the distinguished Members of this body a letter of thanks I just received from one of my constituents.

Danny Falkner just received his masters degree in religious education using the Veterans' Administration education program. His father passed away several months ago after a lengthy and expensive illness. His mother now has cancer and must receive frequent medical treatments. Through all of this tragedy, he still has found the time to express his thanks to the Congress for programs such as medicare, food stamps, and the GI bill. This is what he has to say to all of us:

FIRST ASSEMBLY OF GOD,
Camden, Tenn., June 19, 1977.

Hon. Ed Jones,
House of Representatives, Congress of the
United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Though this letter may seem a little unusual, I want to express my sincere appreciation for a number of things to the Federal Government, rather to the Congress of the United States.

I am first appreciative for the help my mother and dad have received under the medicare program. Up until dad's death a few months ago, he had to receive medical treatment on a frequent basis. Mother continues to use the program now herself. She also uses the stamp program and the S.S.I. Mother has cancer and must see the doctor also on a frequent basis. I just don't know how we could have managed without the help of the medicare and stamp program.

Secondly, I have just recently received my M.A. in Religious Education, primarily through the help that I received through the V.A. Educational program.

Mr. Jones, I am sincere when I say I appreciate the help that we have received. Myself, for the educational help, and for my parents, for their help through the medicare program. Thank you very much.

In some way, I wish you could express to Congress my appreciation for this help my mother and dad, as well as myself, have received.

Respectfully yours,
DANNY R. FALKNER.

EUROPE AND THE PLUTONIUM AGE: PART TWO

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted the first of three articles on Western Europe's plutonium breeder plans. Today I would like to insert the second of these articles which focuses on the issue of nuclear safeguards and security.

The key question that must be answered is, in the words, of this article: "In a world where obscure South Moluccan terrorists can capture and hold hostages in a train and a school for days on end, for example, how can the security of commercial plutonium shipments be insured?"

President Carter's proposed deferral of the plutonium breeder is an effort to seek and negotiate answers to just this type of question. The deferral of the Clinch River breeder reactor project is closely related to these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to insert the second article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 16, 1977]
PLUTONIUM SAFEGUARDS SAFE ENOUGH?—
"THE BUNKER"—LOOK OF NUCLEAR FUTURE
(By Robert Gillette)

WOLFGANG, WEST GERMANY.—Ringed by a double line of barbed wire fence and coils of razor-sharp concertina wire, a squat, concrete building in this industrial suburb of Frankfurt offers a grim vision of a nuclear future.

"We call it The Bunker," explained Wolfgang Stoll, the managing director of ALKEM, a German nuclear fuels firm. "It is our Ft. Knox for plutonium."

A marvel of security engineering, The Bunker seems aptly named. Its concrete walls and floor, 6 feet thick, are packed with so many hundreds of tons of steel reinforcement that the building will deflect the needle of a nearby compass.

Company officials claim the two-story, windowless structure could resist an airplane crash and withstand attack by any non-nuclear weapons for at least 20 minutes.

"We have a hot line to a police station just down the road," Stoll said. "We can have 300 people here within 10 or 15 minutes. If we have any political or union troubles, we can just seal the place up."

When construction is completed in October, the \$8 million bunker will have a storage capacity of 5 metric tons or 11,000 pounds of plutonium oxide, enough to make more than 500 atomic weapons. (Present plans, however, are to store only about one ton at a time.)

The plutonium, of course, is destined not for weapons but for fuel in German nuclear power plants. Looking to a time, perhaps a decade ahead, when the imported uranium it depends upon may become scarce, West Germany is already separating small amounts of plutonium from spent reactor fuel and recycling it experimentally in fresh fuel rods as a partial substitute for uranium.

Over the last 13 years, officials say, the ALKEM fuel fabrication plant here has recycled about 600 kilograms or 1,300 pounds of plutonium into fresh fuel, which has been burned in German reactors.

This is not enough to make any difference in uranium needs but it is enough, Stoll and others contend, to prove the technical feasibility of recycling plutonium as a peaceful atomic fuel.

Although France and Britain are storing their plutonium for use in breeder reactors, at least four other nations besides Germany—Japan, Sweden, Spain, and Belgium—are planning to recycle it in existing reactors as a uranium substitute.

To many American arms control authorities, however, this kind of emerging commerce in plutonium raises grave questions of international security.

In a world where obscure South Moluccan terrorists can capture and hold hostages in a train and a school for days on end, for example, how can the security of commercial plutonium shipments be ensured?

And even if shipments, storage depots and fabrication plants can be made impregnable to frontal assault, is it possible to prevent embezzlement of weapons-grade nuclear fuels from within?

Virtually all civilian nuclear facilities, such as ALKEM's storage bunker, are under safeguards supervised by the International Atomic Energy Commission (IAEA) in Vienna. Critics, however, note that these safeguards empower the IAEA's inspectors to audit the inventory books each facility keeps as a means of detecting thefts and, it is hoped, of deterring them.

But international agencies have no power to enforce minimum standards of physical security. This, like the security of airports and trains, remains the province of each national government.

Although Germany's plutonium bunker may be as assault-proof as modern technology can make it, there is at present no way of ensuring that similar repositories in France, Britain, Spain, Argentina or any other country with a plutonium stockpile will be equally secure.

With this important limitation in mind, one senior American nuclear official described present international nuclear safeguards as no more effective than a "fig leaf."

A former director of nuclear safeguards for the Common Market, Enrico Jacchia, is equally blunt. For all practical purposes, Jacchia said in a commentary in the International Herald Tribune recently a strict nuclear security system "does not exist."

"The ways to cheat international safeguards are innumerable, like the ways of the Lord," he said. "They can be devised in the manner which is most appropriate for each particular situation."

Such questions and criticisms are familiar to German government and industrial authorities who, nevertheless, express a high degree of confidence that their bunker will meet any test.

Perhaps as a measure of this confidence, ALKEM officials described their security precautions in considerable detail to a group of visitors. They asked only that certain details not be photographed, such as the pair of 9-ton doors made of steel, ceramic and vulcanized rubber that guard the only entrance to the inner vault.

Adjacent to the bunker is a small, hermetically sealed fuel fabrication plant. Inside about 150 workers mix powdered

uranium and plutonium oxide, press and bake the mixture to form cylinders of fuel that look like slate-gray rabbit pellets and load the pellets into long metal tubes for shipment to reactors.

Asked how workers would be prevented from walking out with small quantities of plutonium, Stoll pointed to a device at the plant's entrance called a gamma lock. The lock is painted yellow and looks like a telephone booth, but with two sets of doors.

Workers leaving the plant must step through the booth one by one, Stoll explained. If radiation detectors pick up gamma rays emitted by plutonium, the doors lock automatically, trapping the worker until security guards arrive.

The gamma lock is said to be capable of detecting as little as 0.3 grams of plutonium in someone's pocket. If a would-be thief were to shield stolen plutonium in several pounds of lead, Stoll said, he might escape with as much as 3 grams, providing that metal detectors (which have not yet been installed) did not reveal the lead shielding.

Three grams of plutonium is less than one-thousandth the amount needed to make a bomb. It could, however, be used to lend credibility to a nuclear blackmail hoax.

When the plant and its storage bunker are in full operation, ALKEM officials noted, a resident inspector from Euratom, the Common Market's nuclear agency, will be checking the plutonium accounting ledgers against actual inventories. And the IAEA in Vienna will in turn monitor Euratom's audit.

Even so, room for uncertainty remains.

According to a paper on safeguard problems that two German government researchers presented at an international nuclear fuel cycle meeting at Salzburg, Austria, last month, the only certain way at present to verify a nuclear theft is a complete inventory of all nuclear materials at a facility.

This requires not only weighing the plutonium or uranium on hand, but also taking random samples of stored fuel to determine their fissionable content by laboratory analysis.

This, the researchers said, is time-consuming, expensive, intrusive and hampers normal plant operations. "All these difficulties have automatically led to a strong reservation on the part of facility operators and to a reduction in the frequency of physical inventory taking."

Nuclear facilities were said typically to permit no more than one or two complete inventories a year. But according to a training manual the IAEA has prepared for its safeguards inspectors, diverted plutonium or weapons-grade uranium can be converted to weapons in a matter of days, thus raising a question as to whether safeguard accounting procedures can provide timely warning of nuclear theft.

In many respects, ALKEM's fuel fabrication plant and storage bunker are typical of industrial plutonium plants that international inspectors will be monitoring in the future. One important difference, though is that the volume of plutonium it handles is much smaller than that of plants now on the drawing boards in several European countries.

ALKEM officials said the company expects to be able to account for at least 99 percent to 99.5 percent of the 400 kilograms of plutonium expected to pass through the plant each year. This, they acknowledged, means that the amount of "material unaccounted for," or MUF in nuclear jargon, could be as large as 4 kilograms in a year.

When a visitor noted that this was close to the amount needed for an atomic bomb, Stoll, the managing director, said he was convinced that the combined effect of security measures—such as the gamma locks at the entrance and statistical analyses of trends in the MUF—would make it possible to tell the difference between accounting errors, ac-

cidental losses and a theft before the missing amount added up to a bomb.

"What if? What if? Stoll said with a dismissive gesture. "One can play this game endlessly."

In Bonn, an official of the Ministry of Research and Technology, Wolfgang Schmidt-Kuster, summed up a view widely shared by the European and American nuclear industries:

"Recycling plutonium back into the reactor is the safest way of storing and disposing of plutonium."

American and some European arms control authorities strongly disagree. They would prefer that plutonium be left in the protection of intensely radioactive fuel rods and not separated out in pure form—at least not until international safeguards can be strengthened.

In marked contrast with German authorities, French and British officials refuse to discuss any details of plutonium security.

The subject, nevertheless, is becoming a topic of lively discussion in Britain, where critics have focused on two concerns: the difficulties of keeping plutonium out of the wrong hands and the possibility that doing so may require increasing government infringement of personal freedom.

Both problems were raised forcefully last fall in a broad critique of nuclear power published by a royal commission whose chairman, Sir Brian Flowers, is a director of the government's Atomic Energy Authority.

Observing that plutonium appears to pose "unique and terrifying potential for threat and blackmail against society," the Flowers report, as the critique has come to be known, said that necessary security measures may entail wiretaps, informers, the opening of mail and probing of bank accounts, all in "secret surveillance of members of the public and possibly of employees who may make 'undesirable' contacts."

"We regard such activities as highly likely and indeed inevitable," the commission said.

Nuclear industry authorities in Europe and the United States, pointing to security measures that already surround nuclear weapons programs, tend to dismiss such fears as exaggerated.

They are not, however, hypothetical. Or so the case of Klaus Robert Traube suggests.

One of West Germany's most prominent nuclear researchers, Traube, in February, 1976, was quietly dismissed from his job as manager of plutonium breeder reactor research at the Interatom Co. after German intelligence authorities told the firm they suspected him of associating with international terrorists.

According to a recent article in the news magazine *Der Spiegel* that disclosed the episode, German security agents broke into Traube's home illegally without a court order on New Year's Day in 1976 and planted a listening device in his desk.

Government officials, in confirming essential details of the magazine's story, said the bugging was justified by fear that Traube might provide terrorists with blueprints to power plants and other nuclear facilities.

His former employer, Interatom, is a subsidiary of Kraftwerk Union, West Germany's leading vendor of nuclear power plants and the principal shareholder in ALKEM, the plutonium fuel company.

Government officials have also said that an earlier tap on Traube's telephone revealed an association with Inge Hornischer, a Communist lawyer retained by jailed members of terrorist organizations.

Through her, the government said, Traube struck up a friendship with Hans-Joachim Klein in the summer of 1975.

That December, Klein turned up as one of six terrorists who shot their way into the Vienna headquarters of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, killed three persons, and kidnapped more than 30 hostages, including several oil ministers.

After disclosure of the wiretap and bugging two months ago, Traube acknowledged knowing Hornischer and Klein but denied any wrongdoing and demanded an apology from the government.

West German Interior Minister Werner Maihofer has since said that Traube is no longer under suspicion. Though he has exonerated, Traube has not been rehired.

It might be argued that he exercised poor judgment in picking his friends and that German security agencies were acting out of prudence. But the episode lends a measure of prophecy to concerns expressed a year ago by Britain's royal commission.

"What is most to be feared," its report said in discussing nuclear security and civil liberties, "is an insidious growth in surveillance in response to a growing threat as the amount of plutonium in existence, and familiarity with its properties, increases."

Next: the problem of nuclear waste disposal.

THE JUNE ANNIVERSARIES IN LITHUANIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I inserted into the RECORD a statement commemorating the tragic suffering of the Baltic peoples in June 1940, when the Soviet Armies occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Today, I would like to insert an additional editorial from the June edition of the ELTA Bulletin, published by the Information Service of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, which I feel merits the Member's attention:

THE JUNE ANNIVERSARIES IN LITHUANIA

Students of history usually associate the phrase "June Days" with the bloody events in Paris during the Revolution of 1848. Since 1940, however, "June Days" has acquired another meaning in the East European context. For Lithuanians, especially, the phrase evokes a destruction and a loss much greater than the people of Paris could have imagined 120 years ago.

It was on June 15, 1940, that the Red Army assaulted Lithuania and extinguished the nation's freedom and independence. One year later, on June 14-20, 1941, the Soviets resorted to mass terror in the occupied country. Some 5000 Lithuanians were murdered, while 35,000 men, women and children were deported to Siberia. Mass deportations continued into the early 1950's and, coupled with terror inside Lithuania, claimed some 400,000 victims. The Gulag Archipelago became a mass cemetery for the Lithuanian people.

Deportations and terror have been reduced in scale but not in kind since those early June days. As the Lithuanian underground periodical Aušra (No. 5, February 16, 1977), described in this issue, puts it:

"Arrests, trials began, the glorious past of the nation was ignored, its cultural values destroyed . . . 500,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters as well as their supporters perished during the armed national resistance. . . . Physical genocide, as during the period since the beginning of the occupation until Stalin's death, is impossible today. . . . However, Moscow's plan remains the same: to russify the Lithuanian nation, to melt it in the colorless sea of colonists, to displace its language, ethics, to level its customs and culture. . . ."

Soviet prisons and labor camps are today filled with Lithuanians who are trying to defend their culture and religion. A mere attempt to exercise the rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or by the Helsinki Accords brings intense Discrimination at best, Gulag at worst. Even folkloristic or ethnographic activities bring down a swarm of K.G.B. men.

This year, the Lithuanian June anniversaries coincide with the international meeting in Belgrade, a follow-up to the Helsinki Conference. Between Helsinki and Belgrade, the Soviet Union has been constantly invoking "non-interference into the internal affairs" in an attempt to ward off any investigation of Moscow's massive violation of human rights in Lithuania and elsewhere. Lithuanians at home and abroad expect that the Western Powers, notably the United States, will raise the issue of constant Soviet interference into the internal affairs of the countries of East Europe. To do less would mean condoning the Soviet double standard on human rights and on national sovereignty.

MEDICARE IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, under medicare, payment for a physician's service is based on what is determined to be a reasonable charge for the service provided. However, medicare's definition of reasonable charge discriminates against physicians serving in rural areas and acts as a very real disincentive to quality medical care in rural America.

For example, in my State of Michigan, a doctor in an urban area is reimbursed for an initial office visit based on a \$25 fee while in rural Michigan that same visit is reimbursed based on a \$10 fee. Reasonable, it seems, is defined not on the actual cost to provide the service but is determined strictly by locality. Equally trained, equally competent physicians are not paid on the basis of training, knowledge, experience, or ability, but solely on the criteria of where they live.

This discriminatory reimbursement policy has traditionally been defended on the grounds that the cost of living is greater in an urban area and because of the myth that the cost of running a medical practice is greater in Detroit than in northern Michigan. Recent studies refute this however: costs are closely parallel in all parts of the State.

Reinforcing irrational urban-rural, regional, and specialty differentials has several unfortunate consequences. First of all, it encourages an already alarming doctor shortage. In northern Michigan there is 1 physician for every 1,267 persons in contrast to the State average of 1 physician for every 782 persons.

Furthermore, because the medicare reimbursement is inadequate, fewer and fewer doctors are accepting it as their full fee. The result is that beneficiaries—the elderly, those on limited incomes—are forced to pay the sometimes substantial difference between the medicare-mandated "reasonable charge" and the actual charge of the physician.

The legislation I am introducing today accomplishes several things. First or all it establishes a simplified method of reimbursement for physician services for each State on the basis of a uniform fee schedule. Second, it encourages doctors to accept the medicare payment as the full charge by authorizing reimbursement to participating physicians in the full fee schedule amounts and by providing for a simplified multiple-billing procedure.

Equalizing statewide reimbursement for physician services under medicare is a wise and necessary step toward insuring quality medical care in rural America. Rural health care problems are serious, demand our attention, and should not bear the burden of discriminatory reimbursement rates.

VOCATIONAL INTERN SPEAKS

HON. LARRY PRESSLER

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. Speaker, during my first term in Congress I attempted to bring a vocational education student into my Washington office under the LBJ internship program. I inquired into the eligibility of such students and learned that vocational institutions are not considered "institutions of higher learning" and therefore, vocational education students could not qualify for internships under the program.

Discrimination against vocational education students in our society must stop and Congress should be the first to set an example. In an effort to provide equal status to vocational students in the internship program I have introduced an amendment which would provide the same opportunity to postsecondary vocational students as their college counterparts to learn about their Government.

Last year I initiated my own program, utilizing a vocational education student intern in my Washington office during the summer. This year, Mary Hansen from the Lake Area Vocational-Technical Institute in Watertown, S. Dak., was chosen to work in my office. She has written an article on her experience as a vocational education intern which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues:

During the past month I have been working in Congressman Larry Pressler's office. In South Dakota I have been studying at Lake Area Vocational Technical Institute to be a Medical Assistant and I am thankful that the South Dakota Advisory Council on Vocational Education provided the money to enable me to have a chance to visit the Nation's Capitol.

Even though I am not a college student, the knowledge I have gained here is invaluable. Vocational Education strives to give a definite meaning to students by relating training to specific occupational goals. It is unique in that it develops abilities, understanding attitudes, work habits, and appreciations which contribute to a fulfilling and productive life. My experience in Congressman Pressler's office provided me with an

appreciation of how a well-organized office runs. My month also gave me first hand experience working with other people, taking orders, and running office machines I otherwise probably would have not have gotten training on.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 assisted states "so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State . . . will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training." It is my opinion that all Vocational-Technical students can highly profit from time spent at the Nation's Capitol, and I hope my co-workers in Congressman Pressler's office feel that I contributed my part.

As a citizen, I was enlightened as to how the legislative branch of our government operates. People often complain that "nothing is being done in Congress." My month here has shown me just how well the system operates and that our Congress really does quite well considering all the functions that it performs.

In closing, I would like to thank Congressman Pressler and his staff for having me in their office. They provided me with a chance to learn, see, and do many things which I probably would otherwise not have had an opportunity to do so.

THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR IS A NECESSITY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to list the most frequently stated misunderstandings concerning the Clinch River Breeder, I have summarized this factual response which can be verified by consultation with unbiased scientists and engineers experienced in nuclear engineering.

From the New York Times, June 16, 1977, editorial page, I quote:

Plutonium, unlike uranium reactor fuel, can be used to make nuclear bombs. Anyone with a breeder reactor and a reprocessing facility, or merely the ingenuity to steal plutonium could produce nuclear weapons."

The facts, presented by the Office of Technology Assessment are that,

Low technology devices can be fabricated from any fissile material that has sufficient concentrations of uranium 235, uranium 233 or plutonium.

Furthermore, according to the Office of Technology Assessment,

With respect to radioactivity and handling characteristics, uranium 235 clearly offers the least difficulty. Uranium 233 is considerably more radioactive, and this problem is compounded by a small impurity content of uranium 232, which decays through a long chain to thallium-208, which emits penetrating and intense gamma radiation. Finally, causes plutonium dust to be very toxic when plutonium presents serious handling problems principally because its alpha radiation inhaled.

Knowledgeable people are needed to handle plutonium in special facilities in order to assure its safe application.

The administration and some Members

of Congress, clearly want to scuttle Clinch River. The basic retort that opponents use is the Clinch River would foster the spread of nuclear weapons. I therefore, will now turn to the press. Not for technical assessment, but for news. I have attached two articles from the Philadelphia Inquirer for your review. In reading these articles I ask you to consider two points:

First, since uranium can be used to make weapons who now has the stolen cargo of uranium and is not this proliferation? Has not the potential to divert uranium for weapons production not existed for many years?

[From The Philadelphia Inquirer, May 22, 1977]

LOST URANIUM SHOWS ATOMIC SECURITY GAP (By William Drozdiak)

BRUSSELS.—On the fog-shrouded dawn of Nov. 17, 1968, the West German freighter Scheersberg chugged out of Antwerp harbor bound for Genoa with 560 drums of uranium oxide in its hold. The boat never reached its planned destination, but docked 16 days later in a Turkish port, shorn of its sensitive cargo.

The story of the missing uranium was confirmed recently by European Economic Community officials, but it still remains an enigma.

Despite Israeli denials, the most common conjecture is that the 200 tons of uranium turned up in Israel for use at its nuclear-power facilities in Dimona. But how the shipment got there, if it ever did, still baffles European security experts.

Rome sources say that the ore—enough to make 30 nuclear bombs—was hijacked in the Mediterranean and rerouted to Israel's port, Haifa. Other experts, however, point to clues that could indicate that the cargo was secretly intended for Israel all along.

Yet another guess postulates that the uranium ended up in the hands of Palestinian terrorists.

A number of puzzling questions also have surfaced concerning the original transaction behind the uranium shipment.

Asmara Chimie, a West German petrochemical company, purchased the uranium oxide from the Brussels-based Societe Generale des Minerais for \$3.7 million in March 1968. The ore had been mined in Zaïre's Shaba Province.

The sale license stipulated that the cargo was solely intended for "non-nuclear purposes," according to company officials. Under terms of the contract, Asmara would send it to its Milan-based partner, SAICA, to process for use as catalysts in the petrochemical industry.

Three days after the Scheersberg left Antwerp, Asmara cancelled its deal with SAICA (which subsequently received \$30,000 from Asmara as compensation). Thirteen days later, the ship showed up in Iskenderun, Turkey, minus the ore, and, with a different crew.

The failure to track the lost uranium shipment has riveted attention on the need for strict policing in the transport of nuclear materials in Europe. The security services of Euratom, the European nuclear development agency, and those of the nations involved were not only helpless in preventing the alleged theft but also unable to find out where the uranium went.

Moreover, none of the investigating terms ever determined the full involvement of the various companies in the uranium deal. Euratom officials admit that Asmara's role was never explained satisfactorily.

How the uranium actually vanished also remains open to speculation. One guess is that the cargo was hoisted from the Scheersberg in a mid-sea holdup. A more plausible

theory, one Euratom official says, is that the ship was simply diverted to a Middle Eastern port and stripped of its uranium load before being sent back to sea.

Since the ship's original crew has not been traced, no witnesses have ever been produced.

Second, how does U.S. support for a nuclear plant in Communist Yugoslavia illustrate our concern in preventing proliferation?

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 22, 1977]

MONDALE PROMISES TITO AID FOR NUCLEAR PLANT

BELGRADE.—Vice President Walter F. Mondale said yesterday that the United States had approved plans for an American firm to complete work on Communist Yugoslavia's first nuclear power plant.

The announcement, made during Mondale's talks with President Tito, appeared to clear a major stumbling block in relations between the two countries.

It will allow Westinghouse to go ahead with plans to equip and fuel the 632-megawatt plant at Krsko, which originally was slated for completion in 1979.

Work was delayed after the U.S. government ordered a halt in the delivery of vital parts, demanding that Yugoslavia provide additional guarantees that the plant would not be used to make nuclear weapons. Yugoslavia refused, and the matter appeared at an impasse.

Tito, head of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia, has followed a strategy of non-alignment, treading a careful path between the East and West.

Officials said the leaders were expected to discuss the situations in southern Africa, the Middle East and the Mediterranean and East-West detente.

Mondale had met with South African Prime Minister John Vorster in Vienna for two days. He is to leave today for London, winding up his 10-day five-nation European tour.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Technology is deeply concerned about proliferation. Many of my colleagues and I want to do something constructive about it. We want to demonstrate nuclear antiproliferation safeguard system at Clinch River. While the administration talks about thorium, we want to demonstrate its feasibility at Clinch River. Proliferation has been with us since World War II. On May 25, 1945 Canadian scientists became upset when denied data on plutonium chemistry. The United States then agreed to send a limited amount of irradiated uranium to Canada so that they could develop methods for plutonium separation and purification.

I am vitally interested in preventing proliferation. This subject is extremely complex and will require the combined effort of the administration and Congress to determine the most effective antiproliferation measures. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is only one facility that I want to see used for this purpose.

The administration and some Members of Congress claim that the proliferation issue is directly related to Clinch River. Terminating Clinch River in their eyes means no proliferation. The Experimental Breeder Reactor, a small reactor in Idaho, has been producing plutonium for 14 years. While it is presently being used as a converter, it has

and can still be operated as a breeder. The "N" Production Reactor in Washington State which is approaching obsolescence is much larger than Clinch River. It is a plutonium producer for military purposes. It produces heat rated at 4000 MW thermal and it even produces commercial electrical power up to 800 MW. It has been in operation since 1963. The modern breeder reactor, Clinch River, is needed to demonstrate the technical performance and economic performance of the design and construction of this latest generation of nuclear power systems.

The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is a necessity because we need clean energy at a price Americans can afford. All Members are urged to support Clinch River, an important step in demonstrating the next generation of nuclear power systems.

H.R. 7993 TO HELP RELIEVE DOCTOR SHORTAGE IN THE MILITARY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I introduced legislation, H.R. 7993, to reinstate the tax-exempt status for amounts received by individuals under the Public Health Service/National Health Service Corps and Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship programs. As I stated, in the extension of remarks on June 23, this legislation is needed to help assure that the public service objectives of these programs are realized. Taxation of these funds could seriously undermine the attractiveness of these scholarship programs to future health professions students. In a June 25 letter to the Washington Post, a Georgetown medical student urged support for legislation to restore the tax-exempt status as a means of relieving the doctor shortage in our Nation's military. I am inserting a copy of his letter in the Record, and I hope that my distinguished colleagues will give this matter careful consideration:

HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH THE PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

Although the military is facing the worst shortage of physicians in its history, the only "preferred" solutions cited in a front-page article of the June 7 Washington Post were "bonuses" to military physicians and "tax-free scholarships" to medical students. The former is clearly ineffective since doctors are leaving the armed forces at an alarming rate. Moreover, the article was in error as the legislation providing tax-exempt status for the scholarships expired in 1976, so that all portions of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship, the bulk of which is paid directly to the school to cover tuition and books, are considered taxable income.

With the recent climb in medical-school tuitions, some already above \$10,000 a year, taxes alone on this "invisible" income may exceed the only part of the award actually paid directly to the student, a monthly stipend for living expenses. The loss of the stipend in taxes makes medical school unaffordable for some scholarship recipients, despite their willingness to practice in the

Armed Forces after graduating in exchange for the support received during their education. Other students, deciding between the military scholarships and educational-loan programs as the primary means to finance their training, are unquestionably swayed to the latter by the loss of the scholarships' tax-exempt status. A concomitant increase in the availability of such educational loans, provided by the 1976 Health Manpower Act, will further divert students from selecting the enlistment option. Together, these two recent developments severely compromise the Armed Forces Scholarship Program, currently the most important source of young physicians entering the military.

In view of the shortage highlighted in the June 7 article, it is incredible that no serious attempts were initiated on Capitol Hill to maintain the integrity of the scholarships when the laws protecting them from taxation expired last December. We hope that future congressional efforts aimed at relieving the shortage will include the support of proposed legislation, currently in the House, which seeks to return the scholarships' previous tax-exempt status. Failure to establish such legislation will certainly reduce the number of physicians entering the uniformed services, aggravating the shortage that is so rapidly becoming a major crisis.

MICHAEL O'LEARY,

Georgetown University School of Medicine, Class of 1980.

JAMES YORK,

Class of 1980.

Washington.

ENERGY TAX PROGRAM

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, in its consideration of the energy tax program, H.R. 6831, the House Ways and Means Committee has adopted a provision that is both weird and outrageous. I refer to proposed repeal of the Federal income tax deduction for payment of State gasoline taxes.

In effect, the Ways and Means Committee has voted to place a tax on State transportation programs, including, in some States, the development of energy-saving mass transit services.

Even worse, however, it is another blow against the middle-income taxpayer, who is increasingly ravaged by inflation and taxation. First he is taxed by the State for development of transportation services, and now the Federal Government proposes to tax that same portion of his income which has already been taken by the State gasoline tax. This would be a grave injustice. It would be double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, until this time we have pursued a sane and just policy of allowing taxpayers to deduct the major State and local taxes from the Federal income tax base. Deductions are allowed for property taxes, sales taxes, income taxes, and gasoline taxes paid to the State and local governments.

It is easy to understand the reason for these deductions. The personal income taken by State and local taxes should not also be taxed by the Federal Government. This policy is especially impor-

tant when we consider that States and localities provide nearly all the essential services of government, while the Federal role in domestic affairs is to supplement those efforts.

It is extremely unfair and a bad precedent for the House Ways and Means Committee to propose eliminating the deduction for payment of State gasoline taxes.

RURAL POSTAL SERVICE PROTECTION ACT OF 1977

HON. VIRGINIA SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced a bill, H.R. 8048, that I believe will be of great interest to my colleagues who have rural areas and small communities in their districts.

The bill is the Rural Postal Service Protection Act of 1977 and its goal is to prevent the rapid deterioration of mail services to rural areas.

As most of my colleagues know, the U.S. Postal Service—in the name of efficiency and savings—has been waging an intensive campaign to cut back on mail service in rural America. I believe this to be false economy and neglect of the Postal Service's mission to bring quality service to all portions of our country.

To combat this activity, H.R. 8048 would:

Mandate a public hearing and a vote by Postal Service patrons before any existing post office could be closed or rural route consolidated;

Require 6-day delivery service to towns under 100,000 in population and to rural areas;

Insure that each county seat of government has a post office, and

Require an accounting of all Postal Service funds spent on mail services to rural areas and small towns.

Our rural areas, which are oftentimes neglected when Federal services are provided, need some special protection to insure that one of the most vital Federal services—the mail—is not systematically phased out.

To a great extent, the Postal Service management in Washington, D.C., has been insensitive to the needs of rural America. That is why I believe legislation is needed to protect the interests of our farmers, ranchers, and small communities—which are the very heart of America.

So my colleagues and others interested in this important matter might become familiar with the provisions of H.R. 8048, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 404 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) The Postal Service may not—
"(A) close any post office which regularly serves 30 or more households in any rural area or small community or town; or

"(B) consolidate any existing rural route; unless households who are regularly served by such post office or rural route approve such closing or consolidation in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) (A) If the Postal Service proposes to close any post office which regularly serves 30 or more households in any rural area or small community or town, or consolidate or eliminate any existing rural route, the Postal Service shall—

"(i) post a public notice of such proposed action at least 90 days before such action takes effect;

"(ii) conduct a public hearing in the area affected by such action for the purpose of—

"(I) presenting information with respect to the proposed action;

"(II) explaining alternatives to the proposed action which may be taken by the Postal Service; and

"(III) affording interested persons an opportunity to present their views with respect to the proposed action; and

"(iii) conduct a balloting procedure in accordance with subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

"(B) The Postal Service, before taking any proposed action referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, shall distribute ballots to households in the area affected by the proposed action. Each household shall be given an opportunity to return such ballot during the 10-day period immediately after the date upon which the ballot is received. The Postal Service may not carry out the proposed action unless at least two-thirds of the households returning ballots approve such action."

(b) (1) Section 404(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "any post office" the following: "(other than a post office subject to subsection (c) of this section)".

(2) Section 404(b)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "a post office" the following: "(other than a post office subject to subsection (c) of this section)".

(3) Section 404(b)(3) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "a post office" the following: "(other than a post office subject to subsection (c) of this section)".

(4) Section 404(b)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "a post office" the following: "(other than a post office subject to subsection (c) of this section)".

(5) The first sentence of section 404(b)(5) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "post office" the following: "(other than a post office subject to subsection (c) of this section)".

Sec. 2. Section 1001 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (c) through subsection (f), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Postal Service shall appoint a postmaster to serve as the chief administrative officer of each separate postal facility called a post office established or maintained by the Postal Service. No person, other than a postmaster, may act as the chief administrative officer of any such post office."

Sec. 3. Section 2401 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Postal Service shall not reduce the frequency of mail delivery service for any user of the mail residing in any rural area, or in any city or town with a population of less than 100,000, below the frequency of such service which is in effect for such user on March 15, 1977.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Postal Service shall not reduce the frequency of mail delivery service

for any user of the mail residing in any city with a population of 100,000 or more unless the Postal Service submits a proposal relating to such reduction to the Postal Rate Commission in accordance with section 3661 of this title.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'frequency of mail delivery service' means the number of days in any calendar week on which any delivery of mail is made by the Postal Service."

Sec. 4. Section 2401(g) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) thereof, by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a listing of the total expenditures and obligations incurred by the Postal Service in connection with providing postal services to rural areas and small communities and towns for the most recent fiscal year for which information is available, and an estimate of the total expenditures and obligations to be incurred by the Postal Service in connection with providing postal services to rural areas and small communities and towns during the fiscal year for which funds are requested to be appropriated; and"

Sec. 5. (a) Subchapter IV of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3663. Location of post offices

"The Postal Service shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that a post office is established and maintained in the seat of government of each county in any State. Any such post office shall not be subject to any closing or consolidation under section 404 of this title or under any other provision of this title."

(b) The table of sections for subchapter IV of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3663. Location of post offices."

CONGRATULATIONS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, it was a well-deserved honor for you on May 22 when you received the honorary doctor of laws degree at the University of Notre Dame.

As you know, under the leadership of Deans Thomas L. Shaffer and David T. Link, the University of Notre Dame Law School has become one of the most respected law schools in the Nation, in terms of the scholarship of its faculty, the success of its alumni, and its continuing contribution to the advancement of the legal profession.

There are, Mr. Speaker, two law reviews published at Notre Dame Law School: Notre Dame Lawyer, which is properly respected for its studies in case law, and the Journal of Legislation, which specializes in law, legislation, and public policy and has become one of the most influential law reviews in the Nation in terms of its scholarship and its influence on public policy.

I am pleased to serve as a member of the board of advisers of Notre Dame Law School's Journal of Legislation, and to

have been able to review legislative matters and questions of public policy with the journal's editors. I was very pleased to learn that Senator BIRCH BAYH of Indiana, and my respected colleague, Representative RONALD M. MOTTL of Ohio, have been elected to this board of advisers.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in order to extend well-deserved congratulations on your having been awarded the doctor of laws degree at Notre Dame, and in order also to extend congratulations and best wishes to my colleagues, Senator BAYH and Representative MOTTL, on their election to the Notre Dame Journal of Legislation's board of advisers.

A PAY RAISE OR A PAY REDUCTION

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Members of Congress, Federal judges, and 23,000 Federal officials received a substantial pay raise.

My objection to the pay increase was based on the way it was manipulated by the Democrat leadership in such a manner that we had no opportunity to vote on the increase. My opposition took several forms. I testified before the Special Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Presidential Pay Recommendations and stated that I felt it was wrong to increase the salary of a public official who has been elected to a specific term for a specific salary. As in previous years, I have sponsored legislation that would delay a pay raise from taking effect until a general election has intervened between the time the raise is voted and the time that it is implemented. This requires the official to stand accountable for the salary increase along with other issues on election day. The Ohio State Constitution contains this provision and I think it should also be a part of Federal law.

After the pay raise took effect, I, personally, was responsible for adjusting the salary of five employees on the minority staff of our committee. The majority of these employees had had their salaries frozen for a number of years because their salary limit is determined in relationship to the salary paid to Members of Congress. One staff member had his salary frozen for 7 years. Another inequity that resulted from this freeze was the fact that we had the staff director, the assistant director, the chief counsel, and another employee all making the same salary. It was a poor way to run a ship.

On April 26 of this year, an amendment was offered to a legislative authorization bill to delete the amount of money for the pay increase for Congressmen only.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this amendment.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are faced with an entirely different situation and circumstance. We are asked to vote for an

amendment that would have the effect of reducing our own salary in October 1977, and reducing the salary of 23,000 Federal employees. (In this amendment, you cannot reduce one without the other.) Yes, after having a salary increase for 7 months thousands of employees would be returned to the salary they were making the first part of the year! Is this a vote on a pay raise or is it a vote on a pay reduction?

Mr. Speaker, I have thought about this vote for a long time and have reached the conclusion that I must vote against the amendment for the following reasons:

1. The amendment would reduce the salary of five men I know who have worked hard and faithfully for me these many months back to the salary they had at the beginning of the year. I know of no employer in the private sector in my Congressional District who would willingly make such a decision that is so contrary to honesty, decency and fairness.

2. The amendment would mean that for the first time in the history of our country there would be a different salary for Members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. The Constitution never meant for this to be the case. The Senate has already defeated such an amendment and our actions today will not change that.

3. There is a strong case for some increase in salary. I personally think the increase is too high. However, the increase is less than half the percentage of increase in the cost of living since 1969 (61%). It is also less than half the percentage of pay increase received since 1969 by blue collar workers (70%), civil service employees (66%), news reporters and broadcasters (over 80%) and business executives (80%).

4. Since the salary increase took effect, Congress has passed the strongest conflict of interest and full disclosure legislation ever imposed on a public body. In this legislation outside earned income is limited to 15% of one's salary. No other legislative body in the world that I know of has such stringent rules and regulations. I strongly supported this legislation. Without the salary adjustment, this law would not have passed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will write to one and all of my good friends and constituents who want to know why I voted against the amendment and ask them the question: What would you have done in my place if you had given a long overdue pay raise for 7 months to 23,000 people and then been asked to reduce it?

WOMEN IN POLITICS

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to share with my colleagues some ideas expressed this spring at a luncheon hosted by the American Newspaper Women's Club. The theme of the event was "Women in Politics" and the Congresswomen who attended made some observations about trends supporting the increasing participation of women in public service.

Today more young women, often with children, are involved in civic and political activities, contributing their consid-

erable energy and talents to a wide variety of causes.

The American Newspaper Women's Club has long been making an important contribution to the effort to get women involved. By their example as competent and professional women, the members of the club are role models worthy of any young woman. Newspaper women have been especially helpful in writing and encouraging their editors to allot space to stories covering issues of importance to women. The strong presence of women in the press corps—here in Washington and throughout the country—insures that the public is becoming aware that American women are a vital resource to all professions, including that of politics.

By reporting on the successes of women in all professions, the members of the American Newspaper Women's Club give young women more confidence in their future and older women more pride in their considerable accomplishments.

As my distinguished colleague SHIRLEY PETTIS remarked to the club, there is an old saying "that while the cock may croweth, it is the hen that always delivers the goods."

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF MERIT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to award Congressional Medals of Merit to 34 outstanding high school seniors from throughout the 26th Congressional District.

The Congressional Medal, which is awarded to students on the basis of outstanding citizenship, was presented individually during the schools' honors assemblies and graduations, marking the end of the academic year. Each school participating in the Medal of Merit program nominated as their recipient, an outstanding graduating senior who made some notable contribution to his or her school and community. The congressional award consists of a medal and a Congressional Certificate of Merit.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the remarkable accomplishments of the following list of young people to whom the Congressional Medal of Merit was presented in the interest of good government and community service for having demonstrated capabilities in both community and school life while maintaining a high scholastic record:

Peter Whitfield—Albertus Magnus High School.

Rivka Kahan—Bals Yaakova High School of Spring Valley.

Dennis F. Giza—John S. Burke Catholic High School.

John Battlato—Chester High School.

Perri Schwimmer—Clarkstown High School North.

William Bracco—Clarkstown Senior High School South.

Karen Lugg—Cornwall Central High School.

Mark Ernest Thompson—Goshen Central High School.

Kim Kozaczek—Malboro Central High School.

Sally Fellenzer—Middletown High School.

Robin Hassenmeyer—Minisink Valley High School.

Joseph Frandino—Monroe-Woodbury Senior High School.

Debra Ann O'Connell—Mount Saint Mary High School.

Michael Roth—Nanuet Senior High School.

Peter A. Lowry—Newburgh Free Academy.

William Charles Nocera—North Rockland High School.

Mary Grogan—Nyack High School.

Jonathan Todd Harris—James I. O'Neill High School.

Stacy Saetta—Pearl River High School.

Robert James Orr III—Pine Bush Central High School.

David Farace—Port Jervis High School.

Timothy Haines—Ramapo Senior High School.

Mary Ellen D'Andrea—Rosary Academy.

Dorren Thompson—S. S. Seward Institute.

Regina L. Phillips—Spring Valley Senior High School.

Rita Ann Collins—St. Mary's Villa Academy.

Gabriel Hieronymi—Suffern High School.

David Gonzales—Sugar Loaf Union Free School.

James C. Torres II—Tappan Zee High School.

Teresa Brennan—Tuxedo High School.

Nicholas F. Fowler—Valley Central High School.

Kevin Geiger—Wallkill High School.

Richard H. Scheuermann—Warwick Valley High School.

James Scot Tarvin—Washingtonville High School.

PAY RAISE

HON. BILL LEE EVANS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. EVANS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the course of public conduct it is sometimes necessary for a public official to explain his action on matters of great public interest.

Several months ago, Members of Congress, among many other Federal employees including judges, received a pay increase. I tried to get the matter brought before the Congress for a public vote and publicly stated that I would oppose the increase.

However, since that time the House adopted a strict code of ethics which I cosponsored and totally supported. The ethics bill included a provision limiting outside earned income for Members of Congress to 15 percent above the salary.

In view of this limitation, I feel that a rollback of salaries at this point would work a great hardship on Members of Congress and would be unjustified. Primarily because of the increase in pay and because serving in the Congress is a full-time job I supported the ethics bill.

I do not feel that deletion of the funds from the Legislative Appropriations bill to continue at the present level, salaries for Members of Congress, the Vice President, the White House, and other executive branch officials is proper and I oppose the amendment seeking to accomplish this action.

NEW YORK TIMES REVIEWS MR. EILBERG'S GRAND JURY REFORM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 26, the New York Times provided a comprehensive review of efforts underway in Congress to reform the the Federal grand jury system.

The Times focused on three areas: The provisions of a bill introduced by our colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. EILBERG), the Grand Jury Reform Act of 1977, H.R. 94; the control of grand juries by prosecutors; and current activity in California, one of 29 States which proceeds in criminal cases without using a grand jury.

Because I believe this article is a thoughtful analysis, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE GRAND JURY UNDER EXAMINATION; IT HAS
FALLEN ON HARD TIMES

NOTE.—The grand jury—a panel of citizens empowered, and in Federal law and that of 21 states solely empowered, to bring criminal indictments—has recently fallen if not into disrepute at least into controversy. In New York, for example, a number of indictments voted by grand juries advised by former special prosecutor Maurice H. Nadjar have been dismissed for causes including insufficient or illegally obtained evidence and improperly presented cases. Federal prosecutors have allegedly used grand juries to harass radical causes.

A bill introduced in Congress by Representative Joshua Eilberg, Democrat of Pennsylvania, is due for subcommittee hearings this week. The bill would reform Federal practice in several ways—for example, by permitting witnesses to have lawyers in the grand jury room and by providing review of indictments by a judge before trial. Similar reforms are proposed in New York, where a new law that went into effect last week now requires grand jurors, who were formerly volunteers, to be picked from the same pool as trial jurors.

(The articles on this page examine three areas of current concern; the more or less complete prosecutorial control of the grand jury; a number of the reforms now contemplated by state and Federal legislators; and the manner of bringing criminal charges in California, one of the 29 states that have found it possible to proceed in criminal cases without using the grand jury.)

MR. EILBERG'S BILL CALLS FOR REFORM IN THE
FEDERAL PRACTICE

(By Tom Goldstein)

Since the grand jury was imported to this country from England during the Colonial era, an intricate and sophisticated body of law has developed that attempts to balance the interest of individual freedom with the interest of the state in uncovering criminal activity. In the last few years, critics of the grand jury contend that the balance has tipped against the individual, and dozens of proposals to change the grand jury have been made. The following represents some of the issues presented in Congressman Eilberg's bill and in other legislation introduced in Congress and state legislatures:

Protecting the witness

At the urging of the Nixon Administration, Congress in 1970 narrowed the Federal immunity law. That law, which was immediately copied by half the states, grants a grand

jury witness "use" immunity—the witness may be compelled to testify but his compelled testimony may not be used against him in a criminal proceeding.

A year later, New York enacted a "transactional" immunity statute that is broader than the Federal one. Efforts to adopt a similar law on the Federal level are now under way. Under "transactional" immunity, a witness who is compelled to testify may not subsequently be prosecuted—even upon totally independent evidence—for any transaction mentioned in his testimony.

Many prosecutors feel that "transactional" immunity leaves open the possibility that a heinous crime could go unpunished because, during grand jury testimony, a witness who was the perpetrator gave peripheral evidence concerning it. Opponents of "use" immunity argue that it leaves a witness excessively exposed to further prosecution. New witnesses may be found and new information may be gathered as a result of the witness's own testimony before the grand jury.

Allowing lawyers inside

In Federal courts and in most states, lawyers are excluded from the grand jury room. But a lawyer can remain outside the door, and his client can excuse himself from the proceeding to confer with him. Most prosecutors want it that way. Otherwise, they argue, there would be too much opportunity for obstruction and delay.

Defense lawyers want in. They feel it makes little sense to have a witness traveling in and out of the grand jury room. The mere presence of a lawyer, they say, would curb improper questioning by a prosecutor.

Replacing the prosecutor

A variety of proposals would replace or supplement the prosecutor as legal adviser to a grand jury. Instead, there would be an independent office of the grand jury counsel to instruct the grand jury on the law and pass on the admissibility of evidence and competency of witnesses.

Proponents of such an office say that it is unfair to allow the prosecutor to control all the legal information received by a grand jury, especially since the grand jury should be at liberty to disobey a prosecutor's wishes. Opponents say there is no guarantee that the advice of this impartial counsel will be any better than a prosecutor's or that he will be any less likely to abuse his office.

Guarding against leaks

Grand jury proceedings are secret, but periodically there have been unauthorized disclosures. The news that someone is a target of a grand jury investigation—especially if he is never indicted—can be devastating to his reputation.

Some states make it unlawful for anyone but witnesses and lawyers to reveal what has taken place in the grand jury; in Federal court, leaking of information by prosecutors, stenographers or grand jurors is punishable by contempt of court.

Only rarely has anyone been punished for grand jury leaks, and in order to deter them there have been several proposals to stiffen the penalties. But many prosecutors say that the difficulty in investigating and prosecuting violations of secrecy is unrelated to the severity of the penalties imposed. The principal reason, they say, is that the investigation inevitably collides with the protection of a free press guaranteed by the First Amendment.

Since it is not unknown for an errant prosecutor to do the leaking himself, there have been proposals to empower the court to appoint special independent prosecutors to investigate the leaks.

Screening indictments

With the current emphasis on prosecutorial abuse, proposals for greater judicial oversight of grand juries have emerged. One suggestion

would have a judge—but not the judge who empaneled the grand jury—screen all indictments before they are filed. If the judge found insufficient evidence or improper procedures used in the grand jury, the indictment would be dismissed before it was made public, thus sparing the defendant publicity that might damage his reputation.

But most prosecutors feel this would unnecessarily encumber the proceedings. There are not enough grand jury reporters and typists to transcribe all the minutes and not enough judges to review all the proceedings, they say. Moreover, they argue, only a minuscule—though highly publicized—number of indictments are dismissed for legal insufficiency.

Changing the grand jury size

No one is quite sure how the number developed, but from its origins in England a grand jury has consisted of 23 citizens. That number has been carried over to Federal courts and to many state courts. Twelve votes are required to return an indictment, and 16 jurors make up a quorum.

There are those who argue that the current size is more a matter of historic precedent than necessity. They feel that reducing a grand jury's size would be economical and would focus greater responsibility on individual grand jurors. Opponents of this change feel it would make it harder to obtain a quorum and inhibit the expression of divergent views on the jury.

THE PROSECUTOR SEEMS TO HAVE TAKEN OVER
(By Marvin E. Frankel and Gary P. Naftalis)

The notion of the grand jury as a shield for the innocent—presumably at the heart of the reasons for its inclusion in the Bill of Rights—is continually echoed in judicial opinions. Relatively recently the Supreme Court stated:

"Historically [the grand jury] has been regarded as a primary security to the innocent against hasty, malicious and oppressive persecution; it serves the invaluable function in our society of standing between the accuser and the accused . . . to determine whether a charge is founded upon reason or was dictated by an intimidating power or by malice and personal ill will."

Apt as that description may have seemed for the People's Panel in the 18th century, it certainly is not much realized in practice in the 20th. Day in and day out, the grand jury affirms what the prosecutor calls upon it to affirm—investigating as it is led, ignoring what it is never advised to notice, failing to indict or indicting as the prosecutor "submits" that it should. Not surprisingly, the somewhat technical, somewhat complex, occasionally arcane language of indictments is drafted by the prosecutor and handed to the grand jury foreman or forelady for the necessary signature, which is almost invariably affixed. As Federal judge William J. Campbell points out: "Today, the grand jury is the total captive of the prosecutor who, if he is candid, will concede that he can indict anybody, at any time, for almost anything, before any grand jury."

It could not more than rarely be otherwise. In a busy, densely populated, elaborately organized society—where crime is rife, criminals are tough, many wrongs are mysterious and concealed from laymen—law enforcement is inescapably for professionals. The very notion of the grand jury as beneficent for a free society would be subverted by a band of amateurs engaged in sleuthing, summoning, indicting, or not indicting as their "independent" and untutored judgment might dictate. Privacy, security, and reputation would be in steady jeopardy. Sophisticated criminals would be safe; innocent citizens would be less safe.

Those the grand jury "refuses" to indict are likely to be people the prosecution does not want indicted. Many of the cases ending

with a "no true bill" are actually instances where a prosecutor feels the need for such backing to support his own view that further proceedings should not be held.

There is nothing necessarily sinister in this. On the contrary, some cases in which a "crime" has literally been committed—the youthful seducer of a female legally too young to consent; the impulsive, seemingly one-time shoplifter—are for one reason or another difficult for the law-trained official to overlook. The grand jury's dispensing power, kin to the power of a trial jury to acquit the technically "guilty," supplies some needed play in the joints of a system not always supple. But saving graces of this sort do not alter the fact that the grand jury rarely stands in the path of a prosecutor determined to indict. Perhaps it is not realistic to hope for anything sharply different. Indeed, few reformers urge the serious pursuit of this theoretical function.

On the other hand, there is active dissatisfaction that the grand jury seldom does more than the prosecutor asks. It is possible that Watergate, at least temporarily, has added impetus to this sentiment. Rightly or wrongly, it was thought that the Washington grand jury was not being led to sweep broadly or dig deeply in the months before the first trial at which Judge John J. Sirica presided. It appeared to at least some observers that if not for the unusual circumstance of the judge himself insisting upon more intensive inquiries, profound misdeeds might never have come to be prosecuted.

Though they seldom occur, perplexing and dramatic cases sometimes arise when the several main participants—prosecutor, grand jury, and judge—disagree about whether a prosecution should properly be instituted or dropped. The grand jury has an absolute veto over whether to indict. Does the same apply to the prosecutor? So-called runaway grand juries in state courts have succeeded from time to time in bringing prosecutions without the aid, or even over the opposition, of the regularly designated prosecutor.

So, too, special prosecutors have been appointed where the regularly elected or appointed officials have failed to act. The corrupt political machine of Boss Tweed in New York City was successfully pursued by a grand jury that acted independently of, and in spite of, the district attorney. Some 50 years later, Thomas E. Dewey was appointed special prosecutor in New York City because of the seeming nonfeasance of the regularly elected district attorney.

Such unusual cases characteristically involve matters of bitter conflict in the community. Like most "hard" or "great" cases, they tend to make somewhat special, unique, or possibly "bad" law. In any event, state courts remain unclear, and perhaps are shifting even now, on whether judges have the power to appoint special prosecutors to pursue cases the grand jury, but not the regular prosecutor, deems appropriate.

In the Federal picture, the court-appointed special prosecutor has been substantially unknown. In recent times, a Federal rule of criminal procedure has required that an indictment be "signed by the attorney for the government." This sounds like an inescapable and unambiguous barrier to the grand jury's proceeding without that attorney. But people learned in the law have seen means of escaping and possibly overriding barriers that appear insurmountable at first. While the barriers here still stand, the debate may not be over.

On occasion, judges have tried to intervene and prevent prosecutors from dropping cases. But the practical upshot of recent Federal court decisions seems to be that prosecutors can end prosecutions substantially without judicial interference—unless some plain impropriety or dereliction is discovered. The reservation stands as a cautionary sign, a

warning that there may always be a demand for an explanation and an exposure of the prosecutorial decision to public view. But the usual response of a judge to a prosecutor's decision to withdraw an indictment is likely to be relatively unquestioning acquiescence.

In the foreseeable future there will probably be few run-away grand juries and few instances of interference by judges with the prosecutor's plenary control over decisions to begin or withdraw criminal cases. The exceptions will probably arise in situations of uncommonly deep and bitter conflict—where alignments are not predictable and it is not possible to know in advance whose will be the voices of the good or bad guys.

For that among a host of reasons, the precise lines of grand jury and prosecutor authority may never be drawn with finality. The uncertainty has to date been reasonably tolerable. It may even be healthful for the pertinent law to stay a little loose and incomplete, rather than try to freeze an unknown future too hard too far in advance.

CALIFORNIA HAS LEARNED TO SIDESTEP THE SYSTEM

(By Robert Lindsey)

LOS ANGELES.—Almost 20,000 felony cases will be prosecuted in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County this year. But only about 50—one in 400—will be heard by a grand jury. For the vast majority, this is the procedure followed in Los Angeles County and the 57 other counties in California:

Within 48 hours of a defendant's arrest on a felony, he must be arraigned before a municipal court judge, who will schedule what is called a "preliminary hearing" for him, usually within a week of his arrest. The defendant may or may not be released on bail.

At the preliminary hearing, the defendant's lawyer is present. The district attorney is required to bring a complaint against the defendant, producing evidence sufficient to convince a municipal court judge that a crime has been committed, and that there is reason to believe the accused person committed it and should stand trial in superior court.

At the hearing, the defendant may question witnesses and challenge the substance and legality of the evidence—whether it was seized unlawfully, for example. On occasion, judges dismiss cases as too weak during these preliminary hearings. But in practice, most prosecutors present enough evidence to persuade a judge. And most judges appear to give the prosecution the benefit of the doubt in determining whether there is sufficient cause to believe the accused should stand trial.

Nevertheless, defendants under this system appear to have an edge over those processed by grand jury. "There are tremendous advantages," Kenneth Kahn, a Los Angeles criminal lawyer observed. "It lets the defense in on the ground floor. You can cross-examine witnesses, you see the evidence they have against you, and only legally admissible evidence is permitted. In a grand jury, they can use all kinds of garbage as evidence, and the grand jury becomes simply a rubber stamp for the prosecution."

Once the accused person has been bound over to face trial in the Superior Court, which handles felony trials, the district attorney must file a document that legally is the equivalent of a bill of indictment—a list of allegations called an "information." Based on these allegations, the defendant is arraigned in Superior Court, enters a plea, and the trial process begins.

What about the other 50 cases a year? In California, because of statutes and tradition reaching back to the Gold Rush era more than a century ago, grand juries spend most of their time not as prosecutorial organs indicting accused criminals, but as commu-

nity watchdogs to review the operations of county government and attempt to uncover inefficiency, waste and corruption. Only in a small fraction of felony cases do they indict the alleged criminals.

But the district attorney has the option to bring cases to trial through a grand jury if he chooses. According to Joseph Siler, the legal adviser to the Los Angeles County grand jury, the jury here generally becomes involved in criminal cases only in the following categories:

Major frauds and other complex white-collar crimes involving expensive documents or bookkeeping records, many suspects and many lawyers, or other complicating factors that make presentation of allegations difficult or cumbersome at a preliminary hearing;

Crimes alleged to have been committed by public officials or policemen.

Cases in which the prosecution wants to keep an investigation secret, usually to protect witnesses who might be fearful of their safety, where there are still some suspects at large and it is deemed necessary to keep the prosecution secret. Major organized crime cases usually fall in this category.

Cases involving prominent people or those in which the district attorney has other reasons to believe extensive publicity from a preliminary hearing might make it difficult to find an impartial jury. Many of Southern California's most famous defendants of the recent past—Sirhan Sirhan, the murderer of Robert Kennedy; Charles Manson and his crime clan; Patricia Hearst, and other celebrities and those involved in highly publicized cases—have been processed through the grand jury rather than in the "information" procedure.

Because many cases that go before the grand jury are complex financial frauds, jurors can spend up to 40 percent of the time hearing criminal cases, Mr. Siler said. But he said most effort goes into local government. "California has a reputation for extremely honest local government, and I think one of the reasons for this is our grand jury systems," he said.

LAND ACQUISITION AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT IN SOUTH DAKOTA

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, reprinted in the June 10 (page 18551) and June 20, 1977, (page 19867) issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is my correspondence with Mr. Nathaniel Reed, Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks of the Department of the Interior, and Mr. John Popowski, secretary of South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks, concerning wildlife management in South Dakota.

The following correspondence with Mr. Robert Herbst, who has succeeded Mr. Reed, deals with the wildlife management policies of the Carter administration.

It is of interest to my constituents that although only 5,000 of the estimated 300,000 acres of wetlands lost per year are in our State, it appears a disproportionately large percentage of the acquisitions will occur within our borders. It is also of interest that the right of eminent domain is available for these acquisitions.

The correspondence follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1977.

Mr. ROBERT L. HERBST,
Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and
Parks, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERBST: The proposal in the President's message on the environment for a \$50 million budget increase over the next five years to purchase waterfowl habitat is of interest to South Dakotans. I have noted that it is estimated there were 120 million acres of wetlands in the 1950's, that there are only 70 million today, and, further, that wetlands are still being lost at the rate of 300,000 acres per year. Would you please furnish similar estimates for South Dakota?

Please tell me the implications of the President's suggested budget increase. How many additional acres will the increase allow to be purchased? Do you intend to acquire more than the 110,000 acres (40% of 275,000 in the Central Fly-way) Mr. Reed indicated would be purchased in South Dakota over the next 10-15 years? If so, how much more? Do you intend to acquire easements on more than the 220,000 acres Mr. Reed indicated were scheduled for such protection in our state. If so, how many more?

Do you believe all projected wetlands acquisitions and easements can be acquired from willing sellers? Do you feel the right of eminent domain will be required, and do you intend to seek such authority? Do you believe current in lieu of tax payment provisions are adequate, or will you support legislation to provide additional consideration to local governments to protect them against the loss of tax revenues? Will comprehensive economic analyses be undertaken to complement the environmental studies and to ensure that the interests of the affected states and localities are fully considered?

Finally, I am enclosing a copy of my May 7, 1973, letter to your predecessor, Nathaniel Reed, and his reply of August 3, 1976. Would your responses to the questions I directed to him differ in any substantive way? If so, please give me your responses.

Thank you for your prompt attention to these issues of great importance to my constituents.

Sincerely,

JAMES ABDNOR,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1977.

HON. JAMES ABDNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABDNOR: This responds to your June 3 letter about our wetlands acquisition program.

According to the best information available, at least 300,000 acres of wetlands in prime waterfowl breeding and wintering areas are being lost annually as indicated by President Carter in his environmental message. In South Dakota, the estimated wetland losses due to private drainage efforts were about 48,900 acres during the period 1964-74, or about 5,000 acres per year.

The \$50 million increase referred to by the President for acquiring waterfowl habitat over the next five years does not imply any change in the Fish and Wildlife Service's national or regional acquisition goals proposed by this Department during House and Senate hearings on the Wetland Loan Extension Act of 1976, P.L. 94-215. Addition of these funds affirms this Administration's support for the program and provides a part of the funding necessary to help achieve its previously stated objectives. These objectives are nationwide in scope and include acquisition, through fee title and easement purchases, of approximately 1,950,000 acres of key

waterfowl breeding and wintering habitat, principally wetlands, during the next 10-15 years. The \$50 million will purchase approximately 160,000 acres; combined with annual income from the sale of migratory bird hunting and conservation stamps at the present price of \$5.00, the acreage figure will perhaps double. Within the Central Flyway portion of the glaciated prairie pothole region, located in two Dakotas and eastern Montana, our 10-15 year objective is to acquire as waterfowl breeding habitat 275,000 acres in fee title and 550,000 acres of wetland easements. Based on the proportion of unprotected prairie pothole habitat in these three States, about 40 percent of the fee and easement acreage objectives is proposed for acquisition in South Dakota, primarily as small Wetland Production Areas. The actual percentage will depend upon the threats to this habitat and the availability of other means of assuring its preservation.

To date all fee and easement purchases of Waterfowl Production Areas have been from willing sellers. Although we have authority to exercise the right of eminent domain, we intend to continue a policy of buying only from willing sellers. While we cannot rule out condemnation, we do not anticipate that its use will be needed to achieve our objectives if the interest of private landowners in selling habitat to the Service continues at present levels. The requirement that our acquisition proposals receive approval by the Governor or appropriate State agency serves as a check on abuse of condemnation authority.

Payments are provided to countries under the Refuge Revenue Sharing Act. In some countries, payments exceed lost tax revenues; however, there are inequities to others. The current source of funds cannot be depended upon to provide continually increasing payments to countries as land values escalate. A bill introduced in the 95th Congress, H.R. 1341, would provide an alternative formula for in lieu of tax payments as well as a dependable source of funds. I believe that local governments should be compensated fairly for loss of tax revenues resulting from Federal acquisitions.

A final environmental impact statement on the National Wildlife Refuge System was issued by the Service in November 1976. The statement included an analysis of the impact on economic conditions of proposed future acquisition and management of refuges and Waterfowl Production Areas. Although we do not plan to conduct a comprehensive economic analysis on individual purchases, which are generally small units of less than 200 acres, the program was designed to minimize economic impacts on local governments. This was done by introducing the use of easements to preserve wetlands and still retain private ownership and agricultural output from farm units. Approximately three acres have been placed under easement for every acre purchased in fee title and placed in Federal ownership. The Water Bank Program, administered by the Department of Agriculture and coordinated with the Fish and Wildlife Service's acquisition program, is a related approach to preserving and enhancing habitat with a minimum of interference with the local economy.

I have reviewed my predecessor's August 3, 1976, reply and in substance, the Service's land acquisition and management policies continue as stated. My responses to those questions would not differ appreciably from Mr. Reed's. We did recently institute certain changes in the wetland easement document requiring that each wetland covered by the agreement be specifically delineated on a map and recorded with the title. This measure clarifies the location of all wetlands covered by the easement. This was one area where some controversy and confusion existed previously.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this important program and hope the information is useful to you and your constituents.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. HERBST,
Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife
and Parks.

FOREIGN FISHERIES "END-RUN" 200-MILE LIMIT

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, foreign involvement in the U.S. fishing industry continues to capture the headlines.

Most recent are articles by Business Week magazine and the Christian Science Monitor. The Business Week story is the second which that well-known publication has printed in the past 2 months—evidence of its growing interest in the impact these developments will have on our domestic fishing industry.

A hearing on the legislation which Congressman STUDDS and I have introduced to control foreign involvement in our fishing industry is now scheduled for July 18. In view of this I urge my colleagues to take a few moments to read these articles, which are reprinted below:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
June 3, 1977]

FOREIGN FISHERIES "END-RUN" 200-MILE
LIMIT—LOOPHOLES IN U.S. LAW ALLOW SIDE-
STEPPING FOR VESSELS, PLANTS

(By Ward Morehouse III)

BOSTON.—From the crab- and pollack-thick waters off Alaska's Aleutian Islands to the scrod- and squid-rich Georges Bank off New England, a small but growing number of foreign-run fisheries are gathering fresh steam from loopholes in America's new 200-mile fishing limit.

The loopholes may allow foreign investments in the U.S. fishing industry to increase well beyond the current level of 60 partly or fully foreign-owned U.S.-flag fishing vessels and fish processing companies. Fishing industry spokesmen and a coterie of congressmen warn that the loopholes will allow foreign countries a legal bypass of fishing quotas established for the 200-mile fishing zone.

"Theoretically, the Russians could buy the whole New Bedford, Massachusetts, fishing fleet" and the Soviet Union and other nations could "distort the whole intent of the 200-mile limit," because of loopholes, says U.S. Rep. Gerry E. Studds (D) of Massachusetts.

Mr. Studds was the prime sponsor of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, which took effect on March 1. The act is widely hailed as a bonanza for the tempest-tossed U.S. fishing industry.

But the 200-mile limit law, which provides strict quotas for foreign fish catches, also allows foreign firms to own U.S. fishing vessels and processing plants, with two restrictions: The boats have to be made in the United States, and U.S. citizens must make up a majority on the boards of directors of these foreign-owned fishing and processing firms.

Faced with sharply reduced catches because of the 200-mile limit, the Japanese, Korean, Soviet and other foreign firms are scrambling to buy into or increase their control over parts of the U.S. fish business.

"No question about it—foreign investment in the U.S. fishing industry has stepped up

in the wake of the 200-mile limit" in an "end run around the legislation," says Gayle Charles, as economist with the New England Fisheries Steering Committee, a fishing industry group.

Representative Studds and Rep. Les AuCoin (D) of Oregon have filed legislation to limit future foreign investment in U.S. fisheries.

"We oppose the amendment on the grounds that the need for the exception it would make to our general policy on investment has not been established," says Albert Zucca, director of the State Department's Office of fisheries affairs. "Under that policy foreign investors are generally accorded . . . treatment no less favorable than that accorded domestic investors under comparable circumstances."

Against this background, these developments are taking place:

In the cold waters off the Pacific Northwest and the Gulf of Alaska, Korean and Soviet fishing interests want to buy pollock and hake from U.S. fishing boats to avoid having the fish counted toward their own fishing quotas.

The prospective investors have applied to the U.S. Commerce Department for permits to obtain the fish. The Pacific Fishery Management Council, set up by the 200-mile-limit law, opposes granting the permits.

In New England, Spanish diplomats recently asked some New Bedford fishing boats to sell them squid on the high seas, the overtures were rejected.

The Korean Marine Industrial Development Corporation has purchased fifty 86-foot stern trawlers from the Bender Shipbuilding Corporation in Mobile, Alabama, and "the likelihood of them using the boats on the American coasts is greater every day," says Thomas Casey, manager of a fisheries association on Kodiak Island.

The proposed Studds-AuCoin legislation would put a 25 percent cap on all new foreign investment in U.S. fishing boats. As currently drafted it says that if foreign ownership rises above 25 percent, the fish caught by the vessel would have to be counted toward the quotas of the foreign nations.

[From Business Week magazine, June 6, 1977]

THE WAR OVER ALASKA'S FISHERIES

"We didn't invite you here today because we thought the news media would be interested in an Alaska seafood plant expansion announcement," said C. Reid Rogers, president of Seattle-based New England Fish Co. (NEFCO), to a group of reporters last week. The bewildered journalists might have wondered if they heard him right—until he came to the punch line. "The time has come," Rogers continued with emphasis, "to reverse the stagnation of the American fishing industry and meet the challenge presented by the new 200-mi. fisheries zone."

What Rogers was talking about was economic war—a no-holds-barred scramble, with NEFCO on one side and a giant Korean fish-packing company on the other, to gain control of the huge bottom-fish processing business in the Gulf of Alaska and the Bering Sea. And the stakes may be high enough to warrant an all-out effort. NEFCO maintains that the potential value of the bottom-fish business in Alaska could hit \$2 billion annually within eight years. The \$1.7 million processing plant expansion on Kodiak Island that Rogers announced in Seattle was NEFCO's signal that the company thinks it has won the scramble.

THE 200-MILE LIMIT

In 1974, the last year for which complete figures are available, 5½ billion lb. of bottom fish—principally pollock—were taken from within 200 mi. of Alaska. Of that amount, only 30 million lb. of bait fish and halibut were taken by Americans. The bulk of the rest was scooped up in Russian, Japanese,

and Korean nets. Huge factory ships filleted and froze the pollock, which was then shipped home, where it is a major source of protein. A significant amount of the fish pulled out by foreign ships also found its way back into the U.S. as a prime component of frozen fish sticks and filets. Only a negligible American bottom-fish industry could exist while supermechanized factory ships employing labor at 30¢ an hour piled the coastal waters.

But with the advent of the 200-mi. limit on Mar. 1 of this year, Americans were guaranteed as much as they wanted of the total allowable catch for any species. Thus, NEFCO reasoned, if foreigners could be kept out by law, the company could move into the market with an insured source of pollock that it would process and market under its own brand name, Ship Ahoy. NEFCO also could sell frozen fish to other U.S. processors such as Mrs. Paul's Kitchens Inc., of Philadelphia, which buys more than 50 million lb. of pollock each year. Ultimately, NEFCO foresees an export market to both Japan and Korea.

But the company could not proceed with its plans unless control of the pollock fishery by Americans was assured, and that is where NEFCO ran into the Korean Marine Industry Development Corp. (KMIDC). Faced with a tight pollock allocation of 75,800 metric tons this year, the Koreans sought permission to buy American-caught fish and then process them abroad. KMIDC's three factory ships within the 200-mi. limit. KMIDC signed a contract with exporter R. A. Davenney & Associates Inc., which called for Davenney to arrange for 130,000 metric tons of pollock to be delivered to the Korean ships by U.S. fishermen each year.

REAPING THE SPOILS

NEFCO moved at once, claiming that such a deal would be illegal under the new fishery law. Among other violations, said NEFCO, the KMIDC arrangement would double the total pollock quota artificially, thus dangerously depleting the fishery.

The U.S. company turned the problem over to consultant Edward W. Furla Jr., a lawyer and a former Environmental Protection Agency regional administrator. Furla put together a coalition of Kodiak fishermen, Alaskan environmentalists, and labor leaders and lobbied from Kodiak to the banks of the Potomac against government approval of the deal. With the help of Thomas A. Casey, manager of the United Fishermen's Marketing Assn. on Kodiak Island, Furla prevailed upon the North Pacific Fishery Management Council in Anchorage to veto the Korean proposal. Unless it is overturned by the Commerce Dept., the decision is final.

In explaining its vote, the fishery council made it clear that it regarded the nurture of the Alaskan state economy as its prime concern. Harold Lokken, the council vice-chairman, said he was worried that the deal would "replace to a considerable extent American labor with Korean labor" and that the size of the proposed operation would inevitably bring "outside" fishermen to Kodiak.

MORE JOBS

Lokken and the others may also have had in mind some of NEFCO's rosier estimates of the total economic impact of developing U.S. control of the fishery. Specifically, the company claims, protection for American interests would bring 25,000 jobs to Alaska and another 10,000 to Washington state.

Not everyone in Alaska is convinced that NEFCO, which reports \$250 million in annual sales from its worldwide processing operations, has won such a great prize. Only one company, Icicle Seafoods in Petersburg, Alaska, is processing bottom fish today, and most of the 15 other major Alaskan fish processors seem wary of the pollock business. They point out that the fish is extremely perishable and that it might not be feasible for a land-based processor always to receive a catch within the maximum 18 hours it can

wait until processing. More important, Alaskan labor costs are high, and NEFCO may not be able to process pollock at a competitive price. "We certainly will be buying substantial quantities of fish produced by Americans, but at world prices," says Edward J. Piszek, president of Mrs. Paul's. "If Americans want us to pay more than the foreigners, we'll buy from the foreigners."

NEFCO is investing in sophisticated West German equipment for its new plant and says that it will be able to hold costs low enough to compete on the world market. It also has two more processing plants planned for Alaska—evidence of the company's plan to process an increasingly large share of the bottom-fish catch. As NEFCO sees it, the rise in American processing will reduce foreign influence, and that will help turn around the \$1.8 billion balance-of-trade deficit that the U.S. suffers annually from seafood imports alone. The NEFCO plant on Kodiak Island will be able to process 30 million lb. of bottom fish in its first year.

"WE'VE GOT THE FISH"

For its part, KMIDC has not yet given up. Chairman Shim Sang-Joon has taken up his case with Alaskan Governor Jay S. Hammond as well as with a covey of officials in Washington, D.C. He is known to hold exclusive rights to import all pollock above the official quota to Korea, and the lure of that potential business has even led him to argue directly to NEFCO that its plant cannot make any money. Shim is now proposing that a scaled-down "pilot" project be allowed.

While New England Fish Co. seems to have won its battle for now, other American processors and fishing companies face a different threat—takeover by the foreigners (BW—May 9). Some 60 U.S. fishing companies are now owned at least in part by foreign interests, and the number is growing. Under existing regulations, these companies need only have an American board of directors and use American-built boats to fish in order to avoid taking out licenses or worrying about foreign quotas. What is more, American subsidiaries of foreign-owned companies can send their catch back to the parent corporation's home country for subsequent re-import into the U.S.

This situation has moved Representative Les AuCoin (D-Ore.) to propose legislation mandating that, once foreign ownership rises above 25%, the company must register itself as foreign and fish under the quotas for its country of origin. The law, though not expected to pass this term, would be retroactive to Jan. 27 of this year.

The foreign companies and their American subsidiaries are already resisting the AuCoin measure. They regard their access to American fisheries as vital. By the same token, other domestic companies besides NEFCO are beginning to understand what American control and management of the 200-mi. zone can mean in profits. Estimates run as high as \$6 billion for the annual balance-of-trade surplus from the export of American fish, as compared with the \$3.9 billion realized last year from wheat.

"It is a simple matter of developing a natural resource," says Furla, "much the same as the OPEC nations have with their oil. We've got the fish, and we ought to capitalize on that fact."

RADICAL POLICIES OF THE ILWU

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, under the direction of its leftist President Harry Bridges,

has been at the forefront of left-wing politics in America. Harry Bridges is retiring this year, but apparently the radical policies of the ILWU will continue. He has never hidden his admiration and support of communism.

The ILWU recently held its 22d Biennial Convention. The policies and resolutions adopted at the convention show the leftward tilt of this union.

Let's take a look at some of the policies endorsed by the ILWU. One resolution calls for a restoration of full relations, including trade with Cuba, Vietnam, and the People's Republic of China. In particular, the ILWU "calls upon the Carter administration to immediately end the U.S. economic embargo against Cuba and for the restoration of full diplomatic trade and travel relations with Cuba." It also states its support "for full normal diplomatic and trade relations with China" and warns that the "United States continues to intervene in China's internal affairs by maintaining troops and military installations on Taiwan."

This is hard to believe. It is not in our national interest to restore full relations, including trade, with Vietnam, Cuba, and Red China. These nations have no respect for human rights or democratic principles. Nor should we bow to Red Chinese pressure and abandon our friend and ally the Republic of China on Taiwan.

The ILWU also urges repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment which blocks granting of most-favored-nation trade status to the Soviet Union until its citizens are given the right to emigrate. In addition it urges that the ILWU "act as a force within the labor movement to shore up support for a peaceful, non-expansionist U.S. foreign policy. Specifically, we should use whatever influence we have to promote certain pro-détente policies."

And this is just the beginning. The ILWU proposes a \$13.6 billion cut in the U.S. military budget. According to one resolution:

The arms race burdens us with an outrageous military budget to further enlarge an arsenal that could kill the world many times over, and to develop even more sophisticated superweapons of destruction like the B-1 Bomber, the Cruise Missile, and the Trident Submarine.

Despite what the ILWU says, now is simply not the time to slash military expenditures. The Soviet Union has been engaging in a major arms buildup. We cannot afford to stick our heads in the sand and ignore the growing Soviet threat.

In addition, the ILWU endorses the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, a blueprint for a Government-controlled economy. It urges adoption of a national health insurance plan that would run \$80 billion or more a year. It also calls for a massive increase in Government expenditures for public service employment at a cost of \$30 billion.

Support for a nationwide consumer boycott of all U.S. corporations and their subsidiaries doing business in South Africa or Rhodesia, support for repeal of the right-to-work laws, support for increased use of the United Nations to

channel funds between nations, the list goes on and on. It all adds up to a leftist agenda for America.

PRESBYTERIANS IN NEBRASKA PLEAD FOR FAMILY FARM

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the privilege of meeting briefly with J. Marvin Weems, an attorney in Ord, Nebr.

He sent me a copy of a resolution adopted by the First Presbyterian Church of Ord, Nebr.

It contains a message that is important to all Americans, not just those who live in rural areas.

I urge my colleagues to read this resolution which the Presbyterians in this small community in Nebraska so thoughtfully adopted:

OVERTURE ON THE FAMILY FARM, WORLD HUNGER, AND FOREIGN AID BY FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ORD, NEBR.

1. Whereas, nearly 1/2 of the indebted family farmers in 9 states face foreclosure unless they survive an impending Farm Price Credit Crisis.

2. Whereas, Farm foreclosures will have a major adverse impact on the rural community, the small church, the national economy and the cost of food to the consumer because:

(a) Farm foreclosures cause unemployment among farmers, merchants, factory workers and all others economically interrelated with the farmer. Our cities are already overcrowded with unemployed people.

(b) Farm foreclosures tend to replace independent family farmers with investors. As with energy a significant combination of food investors will have the capability of setting food prices at this crisis level.

3. Whereas, immediate action must be taken because:

(a) 1978 will be too late. Bankers are no longer waiting for adequate prices. They are requiring borrowers to cut losses. Bankers are insisting their borrowers sell livestock and commodities at current inadequate prices to finance 1977 seed, fuel and fertilizer. In addition, they are requiring borrowers to voluntarily agree to sell out by March 1, 1978 if profit is not generated by then.

(b) Farmer's Home Administration (FmHA), a Governmental lending agency of the last resort, is out of money.

(c) Most Farmers who have repayment problems would not qualify for FmHA loans. They already owe more than the current FmHA limit.

4. Whereas, the American Family Farmer has demonstrated he can provide the consumer food for less than half of what it costs consumers elsewhere. The average American family only spends 16% of its disposable income for food. This compares with 50% in Russia and 82% in Asia. Necessity has forced the family farmer in our country to become extremely efficient in order to earn a meager living and survive.

5. Whereas, the family farm and the rural community produce more than their share of honest, industrious and inventive citizens and the quality of American life is dependent on maintaining this source of these key human resources.

6. Whereas, the consumer and the farmer

have a vital common interest in seeing to it the family farmer is paid his cost production and a reasonable profit instead of paying the investor what the market will bear.

7. Whereas, 3/4 of humanity is hungry and the American family farmer has the capability of feeding a major portion of that humanity if he can be compensated for his cost of production and a reasonable profit.

8. Therefore, the session of the First Presbyterian Church of Ord, Nebraska in an emergency session on May 29, 1977 calls upon General Assembly, the Synod of Lakes and Prairies, all of their respective judicatories and members of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to:

(a) Recognize the family farm should be preserved and the Family Farmer must be paid his cost of production plus a reasonable profit if this is to be accomplished.

(b) Encourage the Congress and the President of the United States of America to immediately enact and implement the emergency Farm price support and credit legislation needed to preserve our family farms.

(c) Encourage the Congress and the President of the United States of America to recognize the World Hunger Problem and enact farm programs and foreign aid programs which will enable the American Family Farmer to satisfy that need.

(d) Utilize all available resources to inform the public, the Congress and the President of the family farm price and credit crisis and how that crisis can be resolved.

RIGHT-TO-WORK PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning essay of my constituent, Mr. Scott Wyerman of Coatesville, Pa., discussing the right-to-work issue.

Scott is a high school student at the Coatesville Area Senior High School, Chester County, Pa. Approximately 400 students from our State competed in the Pennsylvanians for Right-to-Work Contest with several prizes offered, the first one a \$500 savings bond. In addition, the Coatesville Chamber of Commerce offered two prizes with the first prize a \$100 savings bond. Scott won both first prizes with his essay. I feel it is most deserving of being reprinted in the RECORD and heartily recommend it to my colleagues:

RIGHT-TO-WORK ISSUE

In the 200 years of our nation's existence, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has always been at the forefront of the crusade for justice that best exemplifies the spirit of the American nation and the principles upon which it was founded. But our state is in danger of losing this honored position by not coming to terms with and acting upon a serious issue. The rights of the individual continue to be trampled upon by a power whose abuses are often accepted—organized labor and its leaders.

Unions and their bosses wield tremendous influence in the fields of economics and politics—and even possess the ability to cripple the entire country for long periods of time. Originally organized to protect the workingman's rights, unions have come to occupy an opposite position and now seek to deny individuals the right to work—a fundamental American freedom.

Compulsory unionism is wrong because it is contrary to our democratic system to force a man to join any kind of organization and contribute to its financial support. According to the Chamber of Commerce, "No majority, whether it be a slim 50.1 per cent or a whopping 99.9 per cent, should be able to compel the minority by a popular vote to join or support the majority—whether in a church, a club, or any private organization. The same principle applies to a union."

Right to Work laws also contribute to a state's economic well-being. According to Department of Labor statistics, states with Right to Work laws outstripped other states in the rate of industrial expansion, creation of new jobs, and the rate of improvement in hourly wages.

One of the main issues here is the power of organized labor as a national institution. There have been all too many incidents of union abuses. This misuse has its origins in the 1930's and 40's, the time when organized labor first emerged as a major influence in our society. It was during this time that the concept of the "closed shop" came into being. Under a "closed shop" contract, an employer agreed to hire only persons who were already members of the union.

Then in 1947 came the Taft-Hartley Act, which permitted the "union shop." This gives an employer the right to hire anyone, but the new employee must then join the union after a short waiting period. Many clamored that it was improper for any worker to be compelled to join a union as a condition of his employment. Congress replied by approving 14-B, a single sentence of 44 words, which permits individual states to pass Right to Work laws outlawing the "union shop." Organized labor has put millions of dollars into repealing 14-B, as yet to no avail.

Twenty states have already met the challenge by passing Right to Work reforms. Such a Pennsylvania law would prove immeasurably that our Commonwealth still regards the protection of rights as imperative. The dehumanization of individuals by bureaucratic labor unions must be stopped. We must never lose sight of the common man amidst the tumult of today's world. The pervasive influence of union monopoly must be curbed. The rights of the individual—such an integral part of our American democracy—must be protected.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I note with regret that the recently approved HEW appropriation bill makes no provision for funding section 603 of title VI of the National Defense Education Act or the International Education Act of 1966.

Both these acts are concerned with the international aspects of education. They are based on congressional findings that—

A knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and

cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research . . . to meet the requirements of world leadership.

Just this month the Helsinki commission came to similar conclusions in a resolution urging the President to name a commission to recommend how international education could be strengthened in this country. And President Carter, in his April 14 speech to the Permanent Council of the Organization of American States, announced that the United States was going to expand cultural and educational exchange programs.

But what is really happening? Both section 603 of the National Defense Education Act and the International Education Act of 1966 are again left unfunded despite their importance and the repeated authorizations of Congress. Similarly, the Fulbright-Hays program is being allowed to diminish. In terms of 1967 dollars, the Fulbright-Hays program is today 30 percent smaller than it was 10 years ago. Furthermore, even though the 1978 Fulbright authorization was increased somewhat specifically to respond to the challenge of the Helsinki agreements, that increase was denied in a separate appropriations bill.

The results of this neglect are becoming increasingly serious. For example, only 5 percent of the students enrolled in teacher education programs are receiving any foreign area instruction; foreign language instruction enrollments dropped 30 percent between 1963 and 1974 and are still doing so; only 24 percent of American high school students were studying a foreign language in 1975 and most of them never got beyond the second year; and the list could go on.

It is time that this stopped. We can no longer afford it. The world is too interdependent.

Next year I plan to make a serious effort to secure increased appropriations for these programs. I invite the assistance of interested Members in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue, and I invite the attention of my colleagues to a perceptive article by S. Frederick Starr, secretary of the Kennan Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, on this subject which appeared in the chronicle of higher education which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

NEEDED: A CURE FOR PROVINCIALISM

(By S. Frederick Starr)

Is provincialism on the rise in the American university? Recent evidence suggests that it may be. The number of undergraduates studying foreign languages has declined by 15 percent in the past five years, with the major languages of international communication showing the sharpest drops. Study of foreign languages today claims barely half the percentage of total undergraduate course enrollments that it did in the mid-1960's. Monolingualism, always strong, is spreading.

Nor is the study of foreign cultures booming. The number of foreign-area studies programs has plummeted. In the process, many faculty positions formerly held by persons with a deep familiarity with a specific foreign society have been turned over to generalists. The American Council on Education estimates that about one in 20 undergraduates

enroll in courses that consider foreign peoples and cultures in any way. This is roughly equivalent to 2.5 percent of the 18-to-21 year olds in the population as a whole.

Such developments have been followed closely by specialists at a number of institutions, among them the Modern Language Association and the World Studies Data Bank. All corroborate the same gloomy conclusion—that American higher education is increasingly inclined to ignore languages, cultures, and political systems of most of the other 91 percent of the earth's people.

It cannot be denied that the serious study of such crucial areas as China, the Soviet Union, and Africa is going forward on more campuses now than a generation ago. Foreign-area studies are thus quite decentralized today, a far healthier situation for our education as a whole than that which existed in the past. Moreover, a number of state systems—notably those in California, Wisconsin, and New York—maintain programs on an impressive scale. If one includes student fees, the total investment in international studies has advanced steadily to the present. And if the numbers studying the major international languages is diminishing, an upsurge of interest in Arabic, Persian, and Tagalog is also taking place. Such factors must be weighed against the evidence of decline.

The true picture, however, may actually be worse than the indexes suggest. After all, to say that several million undergraduates are studying foreign languages is to say very little indeed, since the majority of students never get beyond the first-year level. A measurement of language competence at the time of graduation would be far more significant—and more depressing. Only a minuscule number of American college graduates can read, write, and speak effectively in any language other than English, and all available evidence suggest that the number is dropping.

For all the progress made in recent decades, the greatest strengths are still concentrated in the study of just a few major world areas. Others, scarcely less important, remain grossly neglected. Thus, while nearly 300 million people speak Hindi, fewer than 300 Americans are studying the language. There are another half-billion people on earth whose languages together claim the interest of fewer than 500 American students.

All this, added to the severely reduced number of American students and faculty members studying abroad and a corresponding drop in the number of foreign scholars on American campuses, reinforces the conclusion that the current generation may be even less adequately prepared to function in an interdependent world than its predecessors. If not corrected, the situation will be perpetuated by an entire generation of teachers. A survey in 1973 indicated that only 5 per cent of those studying in teacher-education programs received any foreign-area training, while only 53 percent of those receiving Ph.D.'s today are expected to demonstrate even a reading knowledge of a foreign language.

Are we observing the delayed impact of the post-Vietnam isolationism? The debacle in Southeast Asia may have hastened the decline of academic interest in the rest of the world, but it did not initiate it. Indeed, many of the tendencies that strike us so forcefully today were already present before the Tet offensive. Thus, the 58-percent increase in the study of modern foreign languages at colleges and universities between 1960 and 1970 coincided with a much larger increase in the student body. The percentage of undergraduates choosing to study foreign languages peaked as early as 1963 and has been declining steadily ever since. Clearly, then, the causes of the decline in the study of foreign peoples lie deeper than yesterday's headlines.

Many factors contribute to the universi-

ties' neglect of international education, not least of them the behaviorist revolution in the social sciences. But if provincialism is being perpetuated on the American campus, it was surely not created there. Few American newspapers print more than three columns of foreign news during an entire week, and even fewer maintain foreign-affairs specialists on their staffs. A 1973 UNESCO study found that less than 2 per cent of the programming on commercial television touched on foreign themes. The cultural isolationism that our physical separation from other nations once fostered has been perpetuated in a world of instant communication and interdependence.

Students understand without being told that an educated person in this country is not expected to be closely acquainted with any culture but his own. With the help of student pressure, the requirement that a reasonable level of competence in a foreign language be gained before graduation was eliminated between 1966 and 1974 at one out of five American colleges and universities surveyed by the Modern Language Association.

Moreover, some 90 percent of our colleges and universities today have no foreign-language requirements for admission, even for applicants who have studied at high schools that offer excellent programs of instruction. The impact on high-school programs has been predictably disastrous.

The cost to us of our neglect of foreign-language and area studies is immense. Such fields as government, business, law, and journalism are denied the steady flow they deserve of new recruits with broad, yet specific, foreign-area training. Now that we are regularly negotiating with many of the 141 governments in the United Nations over matters of vital concern to our domestic well-being, self-interest requires that we be better informed than even in the past. As President Ford put it in a speech at Notre Dame University last year, "This nation can no longer afford to be isolationist."

By far the largest part of the estimated half-billion dollars a year needed to sustain foreign-area programs in the United States is borne by state educational systems, private endowments, and student fees. The federal contribution, which never surpassed 15 percent of the total, is nonetheless crucial and has declined steadily. But no member of the present Administration has put forward a seriously conceived program for implementing the President's thesis in the field of education. Given this, it may be useful to bring together some of the more promising proposals that have been circulating widely in other quarters. Surprisingly, they do not all require vast outlays of funds.

As a first step, it may be necessary to reintroduce some form of requirements to reverse the quantitative decline in the study of key foreign languages and to give the cue to secondary and primary schools to reassess their programs in the area. Requirements are no panacea, however, and, without other changes, they could do as much harm as good. Drastic revisions in the methods of instruction will in all likelihood be necessary if the qualitative picture is to be significantly affected.

It is probably impossible, for example, to bring large numbers of students to a high level of competence in foreign languages when their studies are constantly interrupted by the simultaneous demands of three or four other courses. It would be far better to compress the process into a single, focused semester or year. Consortia of universities might decide to pool resources to create a series of super-intensive off-campus centers to which students could retire for short periods with the reasonable expectation of coming to grips with a foreign tongue.

Once acquired, a foreign language should

be applied immediately. Under the present system, this is rarely possible, since only the most senior students have acquired sufficient mastery of a language to use it regularly in their work. Hence, at even our greatest universities, most study of foreign peoples and international issues is carried out entirely through English-language sources, the main exception being courses on foreign literatures. Were professors and deans to encourage and assist students to use their language skills throughout their program of study—whatever the field of concentration—the languages would be reinforced and the education as a whole deepened.

How much foreign-language and area education is enough? Clearly, if one is confronted in one's work with a problem that has an important international dimension, it is important to be able to recognize that dimension and to possess the full range of skills needed to explore it further. Beyond that, it is important that there exist somewhere in the United States a self-sustaining group of experts on the languages and cultures of practically every society on earth. Though central to the concept of the original National Defense Education Act, this principle has never adequately been implemented. Nor can it be without a greater degree of federal coordination and support than has heretofore existed.

All discussions of the present and future pool of people with foreign-language training are rendered so imprecise as to be virtually useless by the absence of accurate and widely accepted standards for measuring competence in foreign languages. Until such measures are developed and applied nationally, we will have no choice but to continue to depend on the nonqualitative measures of enrollment that are now used. As things stand, what passes for near-fluency at one school may not pass muster as kitchen chatter at another. Indeed, the measures by which foreign-language skills are evaluated are far less standardized than are those by which karate *aficionados* rank their peers.

These are a few of the more obvious demands of the moment. The *sine qua non* for addressing successfully the issue of provincialism and monolingualism as a whole, however, is not only one legislative or administrative act, but for our expectations in the area to be significantly raised. A whole series of double standards with which we have long rationalized away our failures will have to be abandoned in the process.

It must be freely admitted that such a change in expectations does not correspond to the immediate aspirations of most students. Numerous national commissions, study groups, and individuals experts in diverse fields have argued that it corresponds to the long-range interests of students, however, and certainly to the broader needs of American society as a whole, of which university students are a privileged part.

NUCLEAR POLICY IN TROUBLE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposal to deter our breeder reactor program and the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel has been predicated on one major concern—the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons. While I, too, am concerned over this

subject, I have argued that self-denial of advanced nuclear technology by the United States is not the most effective way for us to influence the actions of other nations.

This is now becoming clear as evidenced by an article in the July 4, 1977 issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Carter's Nuclear Policy: Running Into Trouble." The article establishes that our current policy "is meeting with flat rejection from other nuclear nations." Why then do we continue?

Mr. Speaker, it is evident to me from my service on the Science and Technology Committee and on the Ad Hoc Energy Committee that this Nation needs to develop all the energy sources it can. If one of these sources should have some problem associated with it, then we need to solve that problem. Relegating the energy source to the junk bin is not the answer.

The U.S. News & World Report article shows further that whatever benefit may have appeared possible by a U.S. withdrawal from nuclear power leadership is not likely to be achieved.

CARTER'S NUCLEAR POLICY: RUNNING INTO TROUBLE

(In the U.S. and abroad, opposition is building against the President's bid to block a big and potentially perilous step in nuclear development.)

Jimmy Carter's international nuclear policy is off the ground, but it isn't flying quite the way he wants it to.

His central goal is to get the U.S., along with Western Europe and Japan, to reduce the dangers of proliferating atomic weapons by banning widespread processing and marketing of plutonium for power generation.

That idea is meeting with flat rejection from most other nuclear nations. It is mired down in Congress, too, and is being widely criticized by energy planners and industrial leaders around the world.

On the other hand, Carter's initiative has been a smashing success in at least one way: He has made the world more aware of the lethal hazards of an energy system based on plutonium.

ACCORD WITH CARTER, BUT . . .

Even the critics find little wrong with Carter's goal of reducing the risk of runaway nuclear proliferation. But they part company with him on methods and say that the sacrifices he calls for are unrealistic.

For some countries, restraining nuclear-power development in any way is not regarded as just a sacrifice, but close to economic suicide.

If you pay attention to the heads of European energy agencies, you discover uniform opposition to Carter's plan, all revolving around the critical role they believe that atomic power will play in giving them a measure of energy independence.

President Carter is proposing that the rest of the world rely on the U.S. to enrich uranium for them. European leaders adamantly refuse to put their economies at the mercy of Americans. They have learned a painful lesson trying to deal with the "on again, off again" supply of nuclear fuel coming from the U.S., and they don't intend to repeat.

Recent disclosure of uranium price fixing by a cartel of world suppliers, including Canada, Australia and South Africa, is just one more reason dependent nations are uncomfortable with Carter's policy that relies on an abundance of reasonably priced uranium.

Along with the Japanese, the Europeans are looking to the day when they will move into a plutonium economy with its two key elements:

1. Recycling their own nuclear fuel to get as much energy out of every pound of uranium as possible.

2. Generating electricity with new reactors, called "fast breeders," that make far better use of limited uranium supplies than today's reactors.

With these two critical technologies in hand, Europeans believe that they can drastically reduce their reliance on Mideastern oil and nuclear fuel from the U.S. and Canada.

But these technologies have a problem: They require the isolation of plutonium, a prime material for making nuclear explosives, and a deadly poison as well. The President believes that widespread knowledge of how to isolate plutonium—it's done when spent fuel is reprocessed—along with routine shipment of the material worldwide pose a terrifying threat to global security.

To combat the risk, Carter is calling for the U.S. to drop plans for reprocessing spent fuel and to kill a project that was to demonstrate commercial feasibility of a fast-breeder reactor at Clinch River, Tenn.

In addition to reforms at home, the Carter Administration has been putting pressure on other countries to follow suit.

Canada became the President's best ally by making it tough for other nations to buy uranium without agreeing to limit what will happen to that fuel once it has been used up. The Canadians do not want it reprocessed.

Resistance to the policy has come not only from such key industrial powers as Japan, West Germany, France and Britain, but also from a large number of developing nations.

These smaller countries, in fact, are arguing that the U.S. position is violating the Nonproliferation Treaty, which says countries must be given access to all peaceful nuclear know-how. If not given this access, some developing countries threaten to withdraw from the Treaty, canceling their promise not to build atomic weapons.

In other words, Jimmy Carter's campaign to limit access to key nuclear technologies, ones that might increase the risk of nuclear-weapons potential, may end up creating a shambles of the world's most important weapons-restraining Treaty.

While the Carter move may be having some unforeseen side effects, it has already scored some key successes.

Before the President announced his policy initiative in April, there were two major export deals of great concern on the world market. One was an agreement for France to sell a fuel-reprocessing plant to Pakistan. The other was an arrangement for West Germany to sell Brazil a reprocessing plant, a facility to enrich uranium, and a few reactors.

WHITE HOUSE VICTORIES

The first Carter success was to extract from France and Germany an informal promise not to sell any additional reprocessing plants to other nations. American negotiators did not succeed, however, in persuading West Germany and France to cancel the agreements they already had on the books. In late May, Carter got a second pleasant surprise. The French revealed they were holding up their deal, ostensibly because of the unstable political situation in Pakistan.

Before the French announcement, key German officials in Bonn told U.S. News & World Report that Germany would hold firm with its Brazilian sale as long as France did not break ranks and cancel its agreement with Pakistan. The Germans are not expected to back down on their deal, however, as long as France calls its latest move a delay rather than a cancellation.

A third success that Carter people can claim is the extent to which the President's stand has made the world aware of the risks of plunging willy-nilly into the second phase

of nuclear development, the phase that relies on plutonium.

One aspect of the move that European officials don't appreciate is the added legitimacy Carter's stand has given to antinuclear protesters. Japan, Germany, France, Italy and the Netherlands, in particular, already were having serious problems with antinuclear demonstrations.

All the successes are tempered by a drawback. The Carter policy is encountering a credibility gap regarding U.S. motives and purposes in the three key points of his program: to kill the breeder reactor, drop plans for reprocessing in the U.S. and offer the world a steady supply of American enriched uranium.

THE BREEDER

A nuclear engineer at Britain's fast-breeder reactor in Dounreay, Scotland, just chuckled when asked why he didn't believe the U.S. was honestly getting out of the fast-breeder business.

"Even without the Clinch River demonstration project," he said, "the U.S. will be spending 10 times more on breeder research than any nation in Europe."

Point of fact: The British are spending about 44 million dollars a year on their breeder programs, and the United States—minus any funds for the Clinch River demonstration plant—will spend 450 million.

But the Clinch River project, the building of a 350-megawatt breeder, is far from dead despite Carter's attempts to kill it. Congress is pushing ahead with plans to fund the project with up to 150 million dollars this year.

This gives the Europeans more than a little reason to balk at the notion that they should dismantle their fast-breeder programs. They simply don't believe the U.S. will do it either.

REPROCESSING

President Carter may be successful in delaying for a number of years the reprocessing of spent fuel in the U.S.

What the Europeans point out, however, is that the U.S. Government has been reprocessing for nearly 30 years in its weapons program.

Thus, despite the President's claim that the United States will not get into the business of reprocessing spent fuel from power reactors, the Europeans know that the technology already exists in America. If a country in Europe hopes to stay competitive, planners in France argued, they cannot afford to stop reprocessing just because an American President is worrying about its hazards.

FUEL SUPPLY

Not only are the Europeans and Japanese reluctant to rely on the U.S. for a steady supply of enriched reactor fuel, they also are deeply concerned about how much uranium there really is left in the ground.

President Carter's entire nuclear policy of breeder reactors is based on recent, and radically different, estimates of uranium reserves.

The President says there is plenty of uranium left. European energy planners don't believe him.

This means that while Jimmy Carter has created quite a stir with his nuclear policy in the global community, he has a long way to go before his policy becomes theirs.

EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION ACT OF 1977

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of forthcoming leg-

islation, the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977.

I come from an area, southern California, that is prone to earthquakes. The last major earthquake in the United States occurred in southern California in 1971. That quake took 65 lives and cost over half a billion dollars in property damage. Although the loss of life and damage was relatively small when compared to the devastation of foreign earthquakes in recent years, I can assure all of my colleagues that the effect on life in California was very traumatic. Anyone who has experienced an earthquake of any magnitude finds it an unforgettable and terrifying event. There is a feeling of helplessness that is indescribable when the ground shakes below your feet. Panic in such a case is a natural reaction, but there is no place to hide.

To date we here in the United States have been fortunate that widespread devastation on the order of the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906 has not occurred more frequently. However, there is little doubt that we can expect another large earthquake soon. There is a vast area of land surrounding the San Andreas Fault in California lifted 25 centimeters above its normal elevation. This uplift may be the precursor of an earthquake, and the area is under intensive study. The U.S. Geological Survey has announced that it believes another great earthquake in the area is inevitable and may possibly occur within the next decade. The purpose of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act which we have before us today is to develop the research and prediction capabilities that will lessen the impact of that next great earthquake.

Earthquake hazards reduction programs have high priority in the State of California. Efforts have been stepped up since the 1971 San Fernando quake. The Office of Emergency Services develops programs and coordinates emergency planning, training, and the mutual aid response of all State agencies and local governments. The Emergency Services Act of the California Government Code confers emergency powers on chief executives of the State, including the Governor, chairmen of county boards of supervisors and city mayors, in the event of a disaster, and requires them to be prepared to mitigate the effects of earthquakes which threaten life, property, and the resources of California.

The California State government is monitoring the development of earthquake-forecasting techniques and preparing to modify the emergency-preparedness efforts in the light of new scientific information that might become available. H.R. 6683 is the logical extension to bolster the efforts of States such as California, as well as other States which may be less well-prepared. I would remind my colleagues that California is not alone when we speak of the threat of earthquakes. All told, 39 States, with nearly 35 percent of the U.S. population, lie in zones subject to major damage, and all 50 States are subject to some earthquake hazards. Enactment of this bill will benefit all States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out two concerns I originally had about this

bill and which have been answered by the version we are now considering. First, I was concerned that the Congress was legislating another program that would be forced on State and local governments. I have already described the extensive earthquake programs of California. A federally run program with the usual strings attached could have disrupted the State efforts. I am pleased to say that this is not the case. H.R. 6683 strikes the proper balance of providing a coordinated approach to reducing the hazards of earthquakes without impinging on State initiatives. Instead, the program encourages Federal-State cooperation since the principal responsibility for using the knowledge rests with State and local governments and private individuals.

Second, this bill originally contained the seeds for the growth of another Federal bureaucracy that would grow continually in the future. By doing away with several advisory committees and new offices which were contemplated, this version of the bill eliminates the creation of a new bureaucracy. Instead, greater coordination of present Federal earthquake-related efforts will be achieved without a huge increase in unnecessary personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 6683 when it comes to the House floor next week.

THE HONORABLE "BUD" BROWN EXPLAINS THE HIGH COST OF NOT DEREGULATING NATURAL GAS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Ohio, "Bud" Brown, is well known as one of the top experts on energy in the Congress today. As the ranking minority member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee he has been working extremely hard to pass a rational energy plan which will adequately supply our country's energy needs at reasonable cost.

In the article he points out that there is no way to ultimately get the price of energy down other than by increasing supply. And there is no way to get additional supplies without increasing the incentive for exploration and drilling. The alternative—interestingly—will be higher and higher prices for energy, as we are forced to rely on exotic energy sources like synthetic fuel, and more shortages that will cost America jobs, growth, and high prices.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 1977]
THE COST OF NOT DEREGULATING NATURAL GAS

(By Clarence J. Brown)

Few Americans south or west of Philadelphia have any choice about using the family car to get to work. Most resent being asked to pay unavoidable taxes on gasoline—particularly when it is hinted their tax money will go to welfare or tax reform. Similarly, many Americans in the Northeast know that

federal regulation of the price of natural gas made it impossible for them to get that gas last winter and that the shortage closed their factories and schools and left their homes and hospitals cold.

On the latter point, they have no better authority than President Carter himself. In the middle of that crisis last winter, he proposed and Congress passed an emergency bill to permit the purchase of natural gas at prices above the federally controlled price in order to relieve gas-short areas. His campaign letter to the governor of Oklahoma a few months earlier said:

"The decontrol of producers' prices for new natural gas would provide an incentive for new exploration and would help our nation's oil and gas operators attract needed capital. Deregulation of new gas would encourage sale in the interstate market and help lessen the prospect of shortages in the nonproducing states which rely on interstate supplies. While encouraging new production, this proposal will protect the consumer against sudden, sharp increases in the average price of natural gas."

These were the voices many members of Congress were listening to last week when House committee votes killed the stand-by gasoline tax, severely restricted the auto tax and ordered for deregulation of new natural gas instead of a price ceiling.

Based on the last Congress, last week's votes might have been anticipated by the White House. Two years ago the House rejected a gasoline tax and the Senate voted 58 to 32 for a much broader deregulation bill, which the House barely failed to pass, 205 to 201.

Then it was a two-to-one Democratic Congress with a Republican President recommending deregulation of both petroleum and natural-gas prices, and suggesting that the domestic production thus encouraged might help achieve energy independence. This year it was a Democratic President recommending "world-market" prices on oil, to be achieved by taxation, and "below-market" price ceilings on natural gas in both interstate and intrastate markets on the theory that there is no more domestic oil or gas to be produced before 1985 by higher prices.

But many congressmen clearly discount the "timely" CIA study that supports administration pessimism because every other study of any scholarship indicates supply response at higher prices. And even the most pessimistic of those studies notes the need to balance demand and supply through the price mechanism to stretch domestic oil and gas until coal, nuclear and more exotic fuels can be brought on line. The more optimistic studies indicate such strong supply response to prices as to obviate (or at least delay) expensive and environmentally costly conversions to coal called for in the President's plan.

When an administration spokesman suggested an eight-year, "\$71 billion ripoff" cost of gas deregulation, no mention was made of the estimated \$50 billion cost of public utilities' converting gas boilers to coal in the President's program—not counting the additional cost of needed antipollution systems.

Nor did he mention the \$610 million in wages lost last winter by 1.2 million workers idled by shortages of natural gas—shortages that can be laid to the federally frozen price of \$1.42 per thousand cubic feet.

Nor did he mention the cost to gas consumers of using synthetic gas at \$4.14 because federal regulation prohibited them from buying natural gas for \$2, the price at which demand was being fully met in the unregulated intrastate market. An American Gas Association white paper estimates the cost of substitutes needed to fill in for natural-gas shortages at current regulated prices will total \$30 billion in the next eight years.

The point is that many members of Congress are beginning to suspect that the costs of not deregulating implicit in the President's program may far exceed the costs of deregulating. Treasury Secretary W. Michael Blumenthal conceded in hearings before the House Ad Hoc Energy Committee last month that the gross new taxes to be paid under the President's energy proposals in eight years would be \$132 billion without the potential \$50 billion annual gasoline tax. That is equivalent to an increase of 15 per cent in federal taxes!

This huge federal revenue windfall from energy taxes in the National Energy Act gives the administration great flexibility to pay for expensive new social programs, balance the budget or reduce taxes. In fact, this \$132 billion in new taxes may be the only way to achieve those apparently contradictory promises of the 1976 campaign.

As awareness of the tax dimensions in the President's energy plan grows, more and more Americans seem to be concluding that—if they must pay higher conservation-inducing energy prices—they would rather contribute to energy production than to discretionary federal tax revenues. If energy companies don't re-invest in finding new energy sources, then Uncle Sam can tax the money away from them. If those energy-tax revenues were then spent on mass transit, at least some Americans could avoid paying higher energy costs.

Most members of Congress have been reluctant to criticize the President's energy proposals because there is an energy crisis and it is important that it be addressed successfully. After the failures of the War on Poverty and the Vietnam War, such federal credibility as remains may hinge on our nation's ability to win the Energy War.

But studies by the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have both recently pointed out the errors in the premise, underestimated goals and overstated results in the administration plan. Examination of the program by congressional committees has raised questions that have gone unanswered or to which contradictory answers have been given. Part of the reason is that few of the federal agencies with specialized knowledge on energy matters were in on developing the plan. The Federal Power Commission testified it had not been consulted until the proposals were ready to be submitted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission testified that it had not been consulted and still has concerns about the safety of most of the products now used for insulation for which the administration recommends tax credits.

No one is pleased with such anomalies. But faced with those realities, dismissal of last week's House votes as "preliminary" seems to miss the point. And clearly the White House contention that members were voting in subservience to oil, gas and auto lobbyists is a discouraging sign. Because they were not participants in the drafting of the plan, few members of Congress feel any responsibility of paternity, although all want a successful result. It is time for the White House to talk with people involved in the energy issue rather than at them.

ISRAELI "DEFENSE LINES": THE RHINELAND ANALOGY

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, recent administration policy statements on the

Middle East feature prominently the suggestion that Israel withdraw to its pre-1967 borders, but that defense perimeters be established within the formerly occupied territories for Israel's protection. The following letter, which appeared in the New York Times of June 28, cites one instance in which such an arrangement was attempted and was tragically unsuccessful:

ISRAELI "DEFENSE LINES": THE RHINELAND ANALOGY

To the Editor:

From Vice President Mondale's speech of June 17 it is clear that the Administration's principal tactic in getting Israel and its supporters in the United States to accept Israel's withdrawal to the pre-1967 borders is the distinction between "recognized borders" and "separate lines of defense." This is a promising direction for thought about a settlement. But it should not be uncritically accepted without considering how similar solutions have worked in the past.

There is one great example in the 20th century of such a plan: the Treaty of Versailles. After the First World War, Marshal Foch and other French leaders wished to assure the security of France by separating the Rhineland from Germany, by "recognized borders." On the initiative of the United States and Britain, a solution by "separate lines of defense" was adopted instead: The Rhineland was to be occupied by the armies of the United States, Britain, Belgium and France until the year 1935, when passions would have cooled on both sides, somewhat as the Carter-Mondale plan apparently intends. Afterward, German troops were to remain excluded from the Rhineland. The world remembers how this scheme did not work out.

As time went on, France's allies began to feel that the presence of foreign troops on the territory of a sovereign state was an affront to international normalcy and an inconvenience to their own selfish interests. France was now faced with the dilemma of sacrificing the defensive-line solution in one way or another or losing the diplomatic and military support of her allies. Moreover, the presence of their army on German soil tempted the French to occupy new territory to punish German treaty violations—as Israel would be tempted to respond to terrorism—causing an immediate upheaval in Germany and antagonizing the allies of France. The United States, losing interest in French security, evacuated its zone as early as 1923. Finally, the French too agreed under intense British and American pressure (including the threat of unilateral British withdrawal) to evacuate the remaining area five years early.

All the while the humiliation of foreign troops on German territory festered in the mind of Germany, poisoning relations with France. The denouement came when Hitler came to power three years before the Rhineland had been due to be evacuated, with France now exposed by the disintegration of the "defensive lines" solution and isolated from allies long exasperated by her insistence on that unstable solution.

The historical setting of the Rhineland case obviously differs in many ways from the contemporary Middle East. But the earlier case does suggest that, when it functions in an atmosphere already fearful and antagonistic, a solution relying on the distinction between recognized boundaries and separate defense lines can easily lose international legitimacy. For this reason, and simply because a defense line is so much less firmly rooted and protected by other realities than a state boundary, it can ignite hopes for its premature removal among Arabs and corresponding fears among Israelis. This kind of

settlement may provide tinder for future conflicts rather than pacify them.

(Asst. Prof.) CHARLES FAIRBANKS,
Political Science, Yale University
New Haven, June 19, 1977.

POLYURETHANE PADDING EMITS TOXIC FUMES

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1977

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Norwich Bulletin, as the result of investigative journalism, alerted the Nation through a series of articles, to the dangers inherent in the institutional use of polyurethane padding which, when burned, emits particularly toxic fumes.

One can only wonder if immediate action had been taken across the Nation, as it was in my State of Connecticut in light of the information developed by the Bulletin, whether some of the lives lost in this weekend's Tennessee prison fire might have been saved.

I submit this editorial in national recognition of the public service being performed by the Norwich Bulletin and to call attention, as I have done in a letter to the President, to the need for Federal standards governing the institutional use of polyurethane:

CPSC'S BLOODY HANDS

In a period of about two weeks, 62 persons have died as a result of burning plastic foam used for mattresses or wall padding in penal institutions. Yet the nation is still without adequate standards of flammability for such products, particularly those used in institutions of confinement, such as prisons, mental hospitals or general hospitals.

Last year, in an extensively researched series, The Bulletin brought to public attention the extreme fire hazard of polyurethane mattresses, many of them in current use in Connecticut institutions and throughout the nation. Connecticut was prompt in its reaction to exposure of the danger. It embarked on a massive program to replace all such mattresses with products that meet far higher standards of safety.

But there has been no action at all on the national level, although national standards might bring about a uniform standard of safety. The Bulletin has learned that pleas and petitions from Congressmen and fire officials have been turned down by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, an agency that has boasted of its diligence but shown little in the way of constructive performance. Claims that the major task of CPSC has been public relations, rather than attention to consumer safety, are apparently more than justified.

Were the CPSC to refuse to alter its standards for strictly consumer products, those sold only to the public, it might be excused for its leniency. The public, after all, makes its purchases voluntarily, and is probably subjected to a far smaller degree of risk than the inmate of an institution.

But the institutional inmate is captive to the lack of concern of officials for stringent standards. He is the victim of an imposed risk. And the comparative instability of the institutional inmate multiplies that risk, a fact that was starkly demonstrated in the prison fire Sunday in Columbia, Tenn.

It is not difficult to appreciate the frustration of Connecticut Congressman Christopher J. Dodd and Stewart B. McKinney at being rebuffed by the CPSC in their appeals for higher safety standards for institutions. Their plea was not a political issue nor an attempt to curry favor for special interests. The protection that was requested was for those who are rendered helpless by incarceration and confinement. It is tragic that their point had to be driven home again by unnecessary deaths during the past two weeks. But it has been proved, beyond argument, that the danger of which they warn is both real and pressing. Now they have taken their case to President Carter, who cannot join in the general apathy that has greeted their request to date.

CPSC standards for flammability of mattresses have little to do with the reality of institutional dangers. A mattress would meet CPSC criteria if a burning cigarette does not set it aflame. That has no relationship to, for example, a crazed prison inmate or a mental patient fascinated with fire. It does not address, for another example, the peril of a hospital patient who has inadvertently ignited a waste basket near his bed. It does not encompass the increased hazard of a fire that is started elsewhere in an institution and spreads to mattresses or wall padding.

In all cases, state and local officials cannot be absolved of blame for the tragedies that have occurred from flaming polyurethane. They, too have been alerted to the dangers by professional colleagues and by the stories of tragedy that have appeared in the national news media. They do not have to wait for national action to protect their own charges. Connecticut, for example, did not wait once it learned of the dangers.

But inaction on the part of an agency charged with protection of the public is inexcusable. The President's task now is to delve into the mentalities of the appointees who constitute the Consumer Product Safety Commission and to replace those whose indifference has killed so many in cold blood.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 30, 1977, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 1

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation and management of the Clean Water Act (Public Law 92-500).
4200 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
Health and Readjustment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1775, to amend the Veterans' Physician and Dentists' Pay Comparability Act.
Until noon 6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget
To hold hearings on the new concept of advance budgeting.
357 Russell Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1393, to authorize the Justice Department to initiate suits to enforce constitutional and other federally guaranteed rights of institutionalized persons.
2228 Dirksen Building

JULY 6

10:00 a.m.

Government Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on alleged irregularities in certain spending practices of the Small Business Administration.
3302 Dirksen Building

JULY 7

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on alleged irregularities in certain spending practices of the Small Business Administration.
3302 Dirksen Building

JULY 8

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Federal Spending Practices and Open Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on alleged irregularities in certain spending practices of the Small Business Administration.
3302 Dirksen Building

JULY 11

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on legislation to amend the Truth in Lending Act, including S. 1312 and S. 1501.
5302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Conferees
On H.R. 6655, authorizing funds for housing and community development assistance programs for fiscal years 1978 through 1980.
Room to be announced
JULY 12

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee and Consumer Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on the auto fuel economy section of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
224 Russell Building

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings to evaluate information upon which the FDA based its decision
CXXIII—1362—Part 17

to ban Laetril from interstate commerce.
Until noon 4232 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Education of Handicapped Children Act, and S. 1596, to establish a National Center for the Handicapped.
6202 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs
To consider pending calendar business.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To hold hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.
322 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on legislation to amend the Truth in Lending Act, including S. 1312 and S. 1501.
5302 Dirksen Building

* Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the designated nomination of Richard A. Frank, of Nebraska, to be Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the Department of Commerce.
5110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, (Exec. L., 92d Cong., 1st sess.).
4221 Dirksen Building

1:30 p.m.

Select Ethics
Open, to be followed by a closed session.
1417 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1077, to assure that essential maritime transportation is provided to Alaska, Hawaii, and certain U.S. territories.
5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

* Human Resources
* Handicapped Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Education and Handicapped Children Act, and S. 1596, to establish a National Center for the Handicapped.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on legislation to amend the Truth in Lending Act, including S. 1312 and S. 1501.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.
5110 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the international telecommunications system.
235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations
To review the operation and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.
4221 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
To consider S. 1750, Saccharin Study, Labeling, and Advertising Act, and other committee business.
Until 11:30 a.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1682, to implement the treaties with Mexico and Canada on the execution of penal sentences.
6226 Dirksen Building

JULY 14

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To receive a report from the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages on materials policy research and development.
5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.
Until noon 4232 Dirksen Building

Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed extension of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Education of Handicapped Children Act, and S. 1596, to establish a National Center for the Handicapped.
6202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the international telecommunications system.
457 Russell Building

Foreign Relations
To review the operation and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.
4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Penitentiaries and Corrections Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1682, to implement the treaties with Mexico and Canada on the execution of penal sentences.
6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee and Consumer Subcommittee
To resume joint hearings on the auto fuel economy section of S. 1469, proposed National Energy Act.
5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 15

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To consider pending calendar business.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices Subcommittee
To resume hearings on transportation problems affecting agriculture, forestry, and rural development.
322 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit

plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.

6226 Dirksen Building

Finance

Social Security Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposals for maintaining the financial soundness of the Social Security system.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

To review the operations and effectiveness of the War Powers Resolution of 1973.

4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 18

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no fault benefit plans to compensate motor vehicle accident victims.

Select Small Business

To resume hearings on administrative reporting and investment policies under the Employees Retirement Income Security Act; S. 285, diversification of investment of private pension fund assets; S. 901, to eliminate dual Treasury and Labor Department jurisdiction of ERISA; and S. 1745, to facilitate the establishment of employee retirement plans by small businesses.

424 Russell Building

JULY 19

8:00 a.m.

Agriculture

Agricultural Research and General Legislation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on the Federal Government's role in food safety and quality.

322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To review a report from the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages on materials policy research and development.

5110 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume hearings on biomedical research programs.

Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To hold hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the following five tax treaties: Convention with Israel (Exec. C. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with Egypt (Exec. D. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the United Kingdom (Exec. K. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the Republic of Korea (Exec. P. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); and Convention with the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. C. 95th Cong., 1st sess.).

4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue hearings on biomedical research programs.

Until 1 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs

To consider pending calendar business.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on S. 1381, setting standards for State no-fault benefit plans to compensate motor traffic accident victims.

5110 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1162, to repeal section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, which governs the inter-relationship among communications common carriers providing international record services.

235 Russell Building

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the following five tax treaties: Convention with Israel (Exec. C. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with Egypt (Exec. D. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the United Kingdom (Exec. K. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); Convention with the Republic of Korea (Exec. P. 94th Cong., 2nd sess.); and Convention with the Republic of the Philippines (Exec. C. 95th Cong., 1st sess.).

4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold oversight hearings on the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-210) and amendments proposed thereto.

5110 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue hearings on the Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1162, to repeal section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, which governs the interrelationship among communications common carriers providing international record services.

235 Russell Building

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To consider pending calendar business.

235 Russell Building

JULY 25

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume oversight hearings on the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-210) and amendments proposed thereto.

5110 Dirksen Building

JULY 26

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.

Until 12:30 p.m.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on protocol to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Exec. A. 95th Cong., 1st

sess.), and related protocols (Exec. B. 95th Congress, 1st sess.)

4221 Dirksen Building

JULY 27

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Health and Readjustment Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on a study by the National Academy of Science on health care for American veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the cost of drugs.

Until 12:30 p.m. 4232 Dirksen Building

Human Resources

Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee

To hold hearings in the role of the halfway house in the rehabilitation of alcoholics.

Until noon 1202 Dirksen Building

JULY 29

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To mark up Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

AUGUST 1

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue mark up of Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

AUGUST 2

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.

2226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Budget

To continue mark up of Second Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1978.

357 Russell Building

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.

2226 Dirksen Building

AUGUST 4

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings on the effectiveness of antitrust laws enforcement.

2226 Dirksen Building

SEPTEMBER 21

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 364, Veterans' Administration Administrative Procedure and Judicial Review Act.

Until 1 p.m. Room to be announced

SEPTEMBER 28

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To receive legislative recommendations from representatives of the American Legion.

412 Russell Building